

The CLASSICAL QUARTERLY and CLASSICAL REVIEW are the organs of the Classical Association. The QUARTERLY is published in January, April, and October (double number); the REVIEW in February, May, July, September, November, and December.

The Classical Review

EDITORS { E. HARRISON, M.A., Trinity College, Cambridge.
C. J. FORDYCE, M.A., 3, The University, Glasgow, W. 2

All correspondence should be addressed to Mr. FORDYCE. Books for review should be sent to the Publisher.

Board of Management:

Prof. D. S. ROBERTSON, M.A. (Chairman), representing the Cambridge Philological Society.

J. G. BARRINGTON-WARD, M.A. (Hon. Treas.).

Prof. J. F. DOBSON, M.A.

Prof. H. A. OMEROD, M.A.

F. H. SANDOACH, M.A.

Prof. E. H. WARMINGTON, M.A.

Representing the Council of the Classical Association.

E. A. BARBER, M.A. (Hon. Secretary), representing the Oxford Philological Society.

With the co-operation of Prof. TENNEY FRANK, Johns Hopkins University, Prof. E. K. RAND, Harvard University, and Prof. W. J. WOODHOUSE, University of Sydney.

Vol. L

NOVEMBER, 1936

No. 5

CONTENTS

	PAGE
NOTES AND NEWS	161
ΑΛΛΟΤΡΙΑΣ ΔΙΑΙ Τ'ΝΑΙΚΟΣ. P. T. STEVENS	162
'COCK' IN LATIN. G. P. SHIPP	164
MORE NOTES ON LEWIS AND SHORT. G. B. A. FLETCHER	165
DIRECTION-POSTS ON ROMAN ROADS? M. CARY	166
PLATO, Republic 369D. R. W. CHAPMAN	167
AN EMENDATION OF LEONIDAS OF TARENTUM. R. A. BROWNE	167

Reviews:

Greek Lyric Poetry (Bowra), J. M. EDMONDS, 168; *The Persians of Aeschylus translated* (Tucker), A. M. DALE, 171; *An Introduction to Sophocles* (Webster), F. R. EARP, 171; *De typische Getallen bij Homeros en Herodotos, I* (Blom), H. J. ROSE, 172; *Zeno of Elea* (Lee), W. HAMILTON, 173; *Das Programm des Thukydides* (Grosakinsky), J. E. POWELL, 174; *Demosthenes against Meidias, Androtion, Aristocrates, Timocrates, Aristogeiton* (Vince), A. W. PICKARD-CAMBRIDGE, 175; *Das Beispiel und Vorbild der Vorfahren bei den attischen Rednern und Geschichtschreibern* (Jost), K. J. MAIDMENT, 177; *Die Entstehung der Aristotelischen Logik* (Gohlke), D. J. ALLAN, 177; *La jeunesse d'Origène* (Cadiou), B. S. PAGE, 178; *Le rôle de la mer dans la poésie latine* (de Saint-Denis), A. M. DUFF, 179; *Magnitudo animi* (Knoche), R. G. AUSTIN, 180;

Reviews (continued):

	PAGE
<i>Tacitus: Historiarum libri</i> (Köstermann), E. C. MARCHANT, 180; <i>The Spanish Language</i> (Entwistle); <i>Bibliotheca Scriptorum Medii Recentisque Aevorum</i> ; <i>The Allegory of Love</i> (Lewis); <i>The Hunting of the Snark translated into Latin Elegiacs</i> (Watson), S. GASELEE, 181; <i>The Greek Language in its Evolution</i> (Semenov), L. R. PALMER, 183; <i>Mode in Ancient Greek Music</i> (Winnington-Ingram), H. D. F. KITTO, 184; <i>Greek Sculpture</i> (Wilkinson), A. W. LAWRENCE, 186; <i>Manuel d'Archéologie grecque: La Sculpture, I</i> (Picard), A. W. LAWRENCE, 187; <i>Late Archaic and Early Classical Greek Sculpture in Sicily and South Italy</i> (Ashmole), A. W. LAWRENCE, 188; <i>Hellenistic Architecture</i> (Fyfe), B. ASHMOLE, 189; <i>Ancient Rome as revealed by Recent Discoveries</i> (Van Buren), C. G. HARDIE, 190; <i>Perikles</i> (Willrich), A. W. GOMME, 191; <i>Hellas and Hellenism: Social and Cultural History of Ancient Greece</i> (Vlachos), A. W. GOMME, 192; <i>Lucio Cornelio Silla Dictatore</i> (Lanzani), M. CARY, 193; <i>A History of the Roman World from 138 to 337 A.D.</i> (Parker), F. S. SALISBURY, 194; <i>An Economic Survey of Ancient Rome, II: Roman Egypt</i> (Johnson), H. I. BELL, 195; <i>The Monks of Athos</i> (Dawkins), H. D. F. KITTO, 196; <i>The Birth of the Middle Ages</i> (Moss), E. F. JACOB	197
SHORT REVIEWS	197
SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS	205
BOOKS RECEIVED	207

LONDON: JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET, W.

NEW YORK: G. E. STECHERT & CO., 31-33, EAST 10TH STREET.

Price of the present number, 2s. net. Yearly subscription, 12s. net, post free; U.S.A. \$3. Combined yearly subscription for the CLASSICAL QUARTERLY and the CLASSICAL REVIEW, 25s. net, post free; U.S.A. \$6.25.



CAMBRIDGE ANCIENT HISTORY

VOLUME XI. THE IMPERIAL PEACE, A.D. 70-192

Edited by S. A. COOK, F. E. ADCOCK,
and M. P. CHARLESWORTH. 35s. net.

This volume describes the Roman Empire in the period
from the accession of Vespasian to the death of Commodus.

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS



PANHELLENISM IN ARISTOPHANES

By WILLIAM MEREDITH HUGILL

Assistant Professor of Latin and Greek, University of Manitoba

Did any serious policy underlie the barbed wit and political propaganda of Aristophanes? This discussion is centred upon the *Lysistrata*, where a more positive indication of the serious views of the great comic poet of Athens is found to obtrude into the funny business of his farce. Explanation and corroboration are drawn from many passages in his other plays. This essay offers a complete examination of a document which has never before been adequately explored as a source for the political history of fifth-century Athens, and is a reasoned synopsis of Aristophanes' random but pointed utterances. Planograph, 110 pages, 8/6, cloth bound, 7s. net.

Sold in Great Britain and Ireland by the

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

—THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS—

(S
K
P
C
T
t
u
n
a
c
a
v
o
a
o
s
e
f
g
h
A
P

h
n
h
i
a
n
v
s
n
o
o
n

h
t
t
t
h
v
h
3

The Classical Review

NOVEMBER, 1936

NOTES AND NEWS

TRIED by the same test as a year ago (see C.R. XLIX. 117) *Bibliotheca Philologica Classica*, the bibliographical supplement to Bursian's *Jahresbericht*, comes out better, but not quite well. The subject of a note on 'The fate of the Foedus Cassianum' is disguised, under no. 3964 and in the index, by the misprint 'date'; even 'Notes on Lewis and short' (no. 2909) may mislead; and our contributors suffer such misnomers as C. Field, R. Tarrant, A. Pickard. A welcome improvement is the addition of short notes about some books or articles whose titles do not tell their own tale, though many more titles, such as 'Note in margine', are not eked out. Plenty of these notes in future, even if room has to be found by giving fewer references to reviews, will help this annual to vie with *L'Année Philologique*. For particulars of the present volume see hereinafter (p. 207).

As a sequel to its 'Bibliotheca latina', which was described in the May number of this journal (p. 49), the Belgian quarterly *Les Etudes classiques* intends to give bibliographies of Greek authors one by one, and its October number (Tome V, No. 4) makes a start with eight pages on Xenophon. The same number contains an article 'Comment prononcer le grec', which sets out what is known of the pronunciation of Greek with a view to modifications of Belgian practice. This will interest reformers in the British Isles.

The Spanish classical journal *Emerita*, now in its fourth year of publication, deserves to be better known in this country. Its latest number (IV. 1) takes the form of a bimillenary tribute to Horace; three articles deal with particular Horatian passages, the rest with general aspects of Horace's work. A. Magariños suggests that *Od.* i. 15. 33-6 is an allusion to the possible

destruction of Rome by Antony; J. Pabon supports L. P. Wilkinson's interpretation of *Epode* ix (C.R. XLVII. 1) and explains *vv.* 17-20 on the supposition that Horace saw the battle of Actium from the shore; C. H. Balmori discusses the word *lamas* in *Epist.* i. 13. 10 and connects it with the place-name which is common in Apulia, Venetia and Galicia. A. Tovar discusses the influence of Varro on the *Satires*; G. Bonfanti contributes the first part of a useful detailed study of the popular elements in Horace's vocabulary; P. U. González de la Calle begins a study (in Latin) of the principles of Horatian lyric metres. There is one non-Spanish contributor, J. Marouzeau, who writes in French on 'Horace Assembleur de Mots.'

With a volume dated 1935 but received only this summer *Commentationes Vindobonenses* begins its career as the journal of the Fachschaft der Altphilologen of the University of Vienna. It is intended primarily to provide for the publication of the work of the younger generation of classical scholars but will also include contributions from their elders. In Volume I A. Betz and G. Maresch discuss an inscription recently found at Carnuntum and attempt to discover a Saturnian quotation embedded in it; Maresch also connects the *sator*-formula with Christian origins. R. Hanslik discusses the arrangement of Fronto's Letters and F. Wotke the place of the *Octavius* as a Christian λόγος προτρεπτικός; Gertrud Herzog-Hauser examines Ennius's method of translation from Euripides, and K. Glaser the *envoi* of Herodotus (9. 122). M. Schuster defends the vulgate *vinea* in Pliny, *Ep.* 2. 17. 15. In 'Βίος 'Ελλάδος' L. Radermacher sketches the influence of environment on certain aspects of Greek character

and life. W. Krause writes on 'Bedeutungslehre, Bezeichnungslehre and Begriffslehre,' and A. Lesky on 'Wesenszüge der attischen Klassik.'

The Northumberland and Durham Branch of the Classical Association, which attained its majority three years ago, continues to set an example to its sister-branches by producing a *Third Record of Proceedings* (1929-36), a sequel to the reports issued in 1922 and 1929. It has been prepared, as they were, by

the devoted labour of Mr. Basil Ander-ton, 'paragon of Secretaries,' as Canon How calls him in his foreword. Lectures, discussions and visits to the Wall make up a record of vigorous activity which does credit to the Branch and its officers.

The current notice to competitors for the Hoeufft Medal is on the pattern of last year's, for which see C.R. XLIX. 117. Poems must reach Amsterdam by December 31.

ΑΛΛΟΤΡΙΑΣ ΔΙΑΙ ΓΥΝΑΙΚΟΣ.

THERE are two passages in the *Agamemnon* where there seems to be some doubt about the exact force of *διά* (*diai*) with the genitive, though the point is not discussed in the commentaries (as far as I know) except for a few references in Blaydes (on *Ag.* 448) and a brief note by Verrall (on *Choeph.* 652). The passages are these:

447 ff. τὸν δ' ἐν φοναῖς καλῶς πεσόντ'—
ἀλλοτρίας διαί γυναι-
κός, τάδε σὶγά τις βαυ-
ξεῖ·

(448 *diā* codd. *diai*¹ Hermann ex Cramer,
Anecd. Graeca I, p. 119.)

1453-4 πολλὰ πλάντος γυναικός διαί;
πρὸς γυναικός δ' ἀπέφθισεν βίον.

L. and S. s.v. *διά* quote the first passage (not the second), and explain as 'by her doing', not 'on account of her', placing it in the same category as e.g. *δι' ἐρμηνέως λέγειν*. The instrumental force is of course common of things and, in certain contexts,² of persons, but this is not the shade of meaning called for by the context. An instrument implies an agent; so here the explanation would presumably be that the bloodshed was brought about by some divine power, through the instrumentality of Helen. The conception of a person as the instrument of *Ἄτη* is certainly Aeschylean; in the second Stasimon of this play Helen is so regarded in relation to

Paris,³ and, more indirectly, may be so regarded in relation to Agamemnon. But this does not suit the present context, where the tone is rather one of bitter indignation on behalf of those Greek soldiers who have given their lives, either in a cause that was not their own or because of a sin that was not theirs. In either case a certain contemptuous sense attaches to *ἀλλοτρίας*, and perhaps also to *γυναικός*⁴; they would have less point if Helen were thought of as the instrument of some higher power in the background.

In the second passage, where the reference is to Agamemnon, a contrast seems to be drawn between the immediate connection of Clytemnestra with his death and the more remote connection of Helen with his sufferings. The instrumental force for *διαί* is again inappropriate.

It is probable that *διαί γυναικός*, referring in both passages to the connection of Helen with the Trojan War, will have the same meaning in both. Of the two senses 'on behalf of' and 'because of', both appropriate to the

¹ Cf. Headlam in *Cambridge Praelections* (1906), pp. 118-21. He shows how in 855-974 it is Clytemnestra who appears for Agamemnon in the rôle of temptress or agent of *Ἄτη*, and compares the story in Herod. (VI 135) of the priestess at Paros and Miltiades.

² Cf. 1455 ff., where stress is laid on the fact that a single woman was the cause of death to many, *Ἑλένα μὲν τὰς πολλὰς, τὰς πάντων πολλὰς ψυχὰς ὀλέσας* ὑπὸ Τροίᾳ (repeated in 1465-6); similarly in many other passages in the tragedians, e.g. Eur. *Troades* 368 οἱ διὰ μίαν γυναῖκα καὶ μίαν Κύπριν . . . μυρίους ἀπώλεσαν.

³ For the form see below, p. 164, n. 1.

⁴ As a rule only with *ἐρμηνεύς*, *ἄγγελος*, with pronouns, and with proper names; see Helbing, *Die Präpositionen bei Herodot.* p. 135.

situation, the former is adopted by Tucker (prose translation), 'All for a woman not their own'; Headlam, '"For another's wife!" the growl comes low'; Mazon, 'Pour une femme qui ne lui était rien'; Blaydes, who explains *διαί* as equivalent to *ὑπέρ* or *χάριν*.¹ Similarly in the second passage; e.g. Headlam has 'In a woman's cause'.

διά c. gen. is not, however, elsewhere so used in classical authors.² The usual force of *διά* c. acc. certainly comes nearer to this sense; but though the transition from 'on account of' to 'on behalf of' is easy, *διά* c. acc. does not seem to be used in the latter sense till the fourth century, when there are a few instances in the Orators and Plato,³ e.g. Aeschines III 139 πολλὰ κεκινδυνεύκως ἐν τῇ πολιτείᾳ διὰ Θεβαίων, and Lysias VI 40, Φαίδω 66c 7. In Attic inscriptions *διά* c. acc. is not found at all till 322 B.C., its place being taken by *ἐνεκα* (Meisterhans, 213. 12).

Verrall takes the preposition in the causal sense, 'And all through another's wife' (448), and 'For a woman's sin' (1453). So also Kühner (I p. 485 Anm.), after distinguishing between the uses of gen. and acc. with *διά*, quotes *Ag.* 448 as an instance of freer use in verse: 'durch die Schuld des fremden Weibes, nicht durch ihre Hand'. The Scholiast explains 448 in the words ὅτι δι' ἄλλοτριαν γυναῖκα ἀπώλετο, but his meaning is not certain owing to the common post-classical use of *διά* c. acc. in the sense 'for the sake of'.

διά c. gen. is not the normal usage for this sense either; but there are a few

other passages in Aeschylus where the force of *διά* c. gen. differs from the normal, and should probably be taken as causal. These are

Septem, 233

διὰ θεῶν πόλιν νεμέμεθ' ἀδμάτων.

In such references to the help of the gods *διά* c. acc. 'thanks to, by the grace of' is the usual construction; Kühner (I p. 484) and Helbing (*op. cit.* p. 137) give numerous examples of the acc. in this connection and none of the gen. The context, however, suggests that in this passage *διὰ θεῶν* has the causal sense usually expressed by *διά* c. acc., and means 'thanks to the gods'.

Agamemnon, 1485-6

ἰὴ ἰὴ διαί Διὸς
παναιτίου πανεργέτα.

Here again the force of *διαί* is at any rate primarily causal; the sorrows of the House of Atreus are ascribed to the will of Zeus, the ultimate cause of all things.⁴

Septem, 903-6

κτέανα τὰδ' ἐπιγίνοισ,
δι' ὧν αἰνυμένους,
δι' ὧν νεῖκος ἔβα
καὶ θανάτου τέλος.

The passage has been variously emended, but most editors (with the MSS.) keep *δι' ὧν*, meaning 'on account of which'.

Choephoroe, 655-6

τρίτον τὸδ' ἐκπέραμα δωμάτων καλῶ,
εἰπερ φιλόξεν' ἐστὶν Αἰγίσθου διαί.

Text and interpretation have been disputed,⁵ but Tucker is probably right in keeping the MS. reading and taking *διαί* in the sense 'thanks to, by grace of': 'If Aegisthus permits the house to give welcome to strangers'. He compares 641 *διαί Δίκας* 'thanks to, by the help of Justice'.

These passages seem to provide sufficient evidence for the use of *διά* (*διαί*) c. gen. by Aeschylus in a causal sense. Verrall's view (on *Choeph.* 652 *Αἰγίσθου διαί*) that both form and syntax are archaic and agree with each

¹ Hartung actually conjectured *χάριν* for *διά* in this passage.

² In the Koine *διά* c. acc. in the sense 'for the sake of' becomes common, and there are some examples of *διά* c. gen. in this sense, partly owing to the lack of feeling for the distinction between the uses of gen. and acc., and partly to the influence of the gen. with *ὑπέρ* etc. See Blass-Debrunner, *Neutestamentliche Grammatik*, § 222; E. Nachmanson, 'Syntaktische Inschriftenstudien', *Erano* IX, pp. 30-81, No. 6.

³ Kühner (484-5) does not notice this use of *διά* c. acc. He refers to a very similar use, where *διά* c. acc. is equivalent to a purpose clause, in four passages in Thuc., but IV 102 is probably a later adscript, and the same may be true of the others (cf. Rutherford, *Thuc.* IV p. xxxix).

⁴ For other passages in both classical and Christian literature where the conception of God as the cause of all things finds expression see Norden, *Agnostos Theos*, pp. 157, 240 ff., 347-8.

⁵ Conington defends the text, but takes *διαί* in the sense 'in the hands of'.

other is apparently true of the form¹ but without foundation as regards the syntax. It is in fact not till towards the close of the classical period that we find another instance of *διά c. gen.* in a causal sense in Plato, *Timaeus* 57c *διὰ τοιούτων αἰτιῶν γέγονε*.² In Aristotle the distinction between the uses of *gen.* and *acc.* with *διά* is clearly wearing thin, and in some later writers, e.g. Polybius, it is often ignored.³

Various influences may have been at work in producing this usage in Aeschylus. In the first place the confusion between the uses of *gen.* and *acc.* with *διά* must have begun in ordinary speech a considerable time before its frequent appearance in literature. In the second place analogy may have played a part in certain cases. Though in *διαί γυναικός* the force of the prep.

is primarily causal, the common conception of Helen as the prize to be fought for might well be present in the mind of Aeschylus, so that the *gen.* case normally used, in his time, with prepositions that bore this meaning (*ὑπέρ*, *ἀμφί* etc.) influenced the construction with *διαί*.⁴ The suggestion that analogy might easily be at work in such a context is supported by a consideration of some of the many passages in which Helen's connection with the Trojan War is alluded to. Compare in the *Agamemnon* itself 62 *πολύανδρος ἀμφί γυναικός* and 800 *Ἑλένης ἔνεκ*, where Helen is the prize to be fought for. So generally in earlier poets, e.g. *Il.* III 157 *τοιγὶδ' ἀμφί γυναικὶ . . . πᾶσχειν*, Alcaeus B 14 No. 26 (Lobel) *οἱ δ' ἀπώλοντ' ἀμφ' Ἑ[λέναι]*, Pind. *Pyth.* XI 33, *Paeon* VI 95. The abnormality in usage would be the easier with *διαί*, since the prep. had a form also removed from ordinary use. Lastly it is possible, though the point should not be stressed, that metrical considerations may have had some influence.⁵

P. T. STEVENS.

King's College, Aberdeen.

¹ *διαί*, apparently peculiar to Aeschylus, is no doubt formed on the analogy of *παπαί* and *καταί* and used as an archaic and poetical variant, mainly for metrical reasons. On the origin of the ending *-αι* see Brugmann § 260.

² The use of the *gen.* is perhaps due to the cause being regarded almost as an agent; cf. *Laus* 701B 2 and Arist. *De Part. An.* 641b 16 *εἰκὸς τὸν οὐρανὸν γεγενῆσθαι ὑπὸ τοιαύτης αἰτίας . . . καὶ εἶναι διὰ τοιαύτην αἰτίαν*. Adam's emendation *δι' οὗ* (codd. *δι' οὗ*) in *Rep.* 562B 8 is justified, since the sense there required is 'because of', i.e. 'for the sake of', and it is unlikely that P. would use *διά c. gen.* in this sense in a context where it might be wrongly interpreted as instrumental.

³ Eucken, *Ueber den Sprachgebrauch des Arist.*, p. 39; Krebs, *Die Präpp. bei Polyb.*, p. 68.

⁴ In the post-classical period, when *διά c. acc.* was normally used in the sense 'on behalf of', there are some instances where, by analogy with *διά*, the *acc.* is used with *ὑπέρ* in this sense. See Jannaris, *Hist. Gr. Gr.* § 1680.

⁵ I am indebted to Professor A. Cameron for several suggestions in connection with this article.

'COCK' IN LATIN

IN JUV. 3, 91

miratur vocem angustam, qua deterius nec
ille sonat quo mordetur gallina marito

the satirist, in indulging his fancy for the grotesque phrase, has made a virtue of necessity. It is a roundabout expression, not, as Duff says, for *gallus*, but for *gallus gallinaceus*. For this fuller expression was the real Latin for 'cock', as I find was already noticed by Facciolati ('Gallus: avis domestica, quam vulgo gallum gallinaceum vocant, ut illum distinguant a Gallis populis, seu Francis, item a Gallis sacerdotibus'). In the passage before us

Juvenal's reason for avoiding the simple *gallus* is obvious. To the Romans of his day, especially to the *urbani*, the word would suggest at least as readily the *Gallus sacerdos*, and here confusion would be the easier because the priest of Cybele would also have what Seneca calls a *tenuis et stridula vox* (*Epist. Mor.* 6. 4. 2). The full term would be too clumsy for Juvenal.

If we look at other passages where cocks are mentioned we find that in fact *gallus* alone is used only when there is no possible doubt, either because the fuller phrase has already occurred, as in Plaut. *Aul.* 469 and 470,

or because the talk is of the poultry-yard, as often in Columella Bk. VIII or in phrases like *ad cantum galli . . . secundi* Juv. 9. 107. Other passages where the fuller phrase is used are:

(a) Plaut. *Aul.* 465-6:

Condigne etiam meus med intus gallus gallinacius | qui erat anu peculiaris perdidit paenissime.

(472 is bracketed by Goetz and Schoell following Guyet.)

(b) Cic. *Mur.* 61:

nec minus delinquere eum qui gallum gallinacium . . . quam eum qui patrem suffocaverit.

Here, as Professor Todd has pointed out to me, 'It might have amused the ribald to take *gallum*, without *gallinacium*, in the sense of a *castrato*, since

galli of that sort cannot possibly be *patres*.'

(c) Cic. *Div.* 1. 74:

cumque eodem tempore apud Lebadiam Trophonio res divina fieret, gallos gallinaceos in eo loco sic adsidue canere coepisse, ut nihil intermitterent.

(d) *Div.* 2. 56 in a passage similar to (c).

To me it is probable that excepting in old Latin it was confusion with the priest rather than with the Gaul that needed avoiding. This is illustrated further by Martial XIII 63:

Ne nimis exhausto macresceret inguine gallus
amisit testes. nunc mihi gallus erit.

G. P. SHIPP.

University of Sydney.

MORE NOTES ON LEWIS AND SHORT.

It is fortunate that Georges's Latin lexicon is as trustworthy as it is, for, as scholars have long been aware, the number of errors and omissions in Lewis and Short is enormous—I have myself noticed more than 500, a few of which I pointed out some years ago—and Professor R. L. Dunbabin in *C.R.* XLVIII, 1934, pp. 212-214 and XLIX, 1935, pp. 9-12, and Mr. W. S. Maguinness in *C.R. L.*, 1936, pp. 9-10, following Dr. W. R. Inge in *C.R.* VIII, 1894, pp. 25-27, whose paper Mr. Maguinness seems, from his note on *idtus*, not to know, are only scratching at the surface. The following miscellaneous points are a few which are of particular interest.

antehabeo should not be asterisked; it occurs also at Tac. *Ann.* I. 58.

audeo. L.S. cite no example of this word followed by the perfect infinitive. Hey in *Thes. Ling. Lat.* II, 1254, 12 gives no example earlier than Lucan, not mentioning Tib. II. 1. 9-10.

callidus. L.S. quote examples of this word followed by the genitive only from Col. and Tac. For Cic., Liv., and Ov. see *Th.L.L.*

cautus. Give the devil his due. L.S. rightly quote for this word followed by *ad* Liv. XXIV. 32. 3, but Poeschel in *Th.L.L.* gives no example in prose, and only one in verse, before Quint.

contemplabilis: 'only in Amm.'; also in Jerome, Claud. Mam. and others.

dicio: 'in plur. once'; the plur. occurs also at Prud. *Symm.* II. 420 and *Perist.* VII. 8, of which the former passage is missed by Bögel in *Th.L.L.* V, 960, 15-16 but noted at 961, 17, and in Gregory of Tours.

discurso is not cited earlier than Quintilian, but see Sen. *Dial.* X. 14. 3.

extorris. L.S. say nothing of this word followed by a genitive, but it is so found in Stat. *Theb.* IX. 578 and XII. 262 and in several later writers.

festinatus is not mentioned, but it occurs in Suet. *Aug.* 29. 1, which is wrongly quoted as containing an example of *festinanti*, and in Amm. XXIV. 6. 11.

geographus is omitted. *Th.L.L.* gives one example, Georges gives two.

gravidulus is omitted; Amm. XXIII. 6. 85.

illacrimosus is omitted; Amm. XIV. 11. 24.

immunis. L.S. quote examples of this word followed by a genitive from poets and, among prose authors, from Liv., Vell. Pat., and Tac.; add Cic. *Verr.* V. 58.

integer. Neither L.S. nor Georges cites *de integro* before Cic.; see Ter. *Ad.* 153, *Heaut.* 674.

perhumilis is omitted; Amm. XVI. 10. 10.

permutabilis is omitted; Amm. XXXI. 2. 11.

praegressus is quoted only from Amm., but it is rightly read at Cic. *De Off.* I. 11.

quam. Under II. 2 as an example of ellipse of corresponding *tam* is quoted Tac. *Ann.* IV. 61; but it is an example of ellipse of *magis* and belongs under II. 20.

sicine: 'once in Cic.'; it occurs at least twice, *Pro Flacco* 81 and *De Fin.* I. 34. L. Laurand, *Études sur le style des discours de Cicéron*, Volume III (Paris, 1927), p. 397 wrongly gives the word as used by Cicero in prose but not in his speeches.

L.S. rightly quote examples from

Livy, but Georges unaccountably mentions no one but Plaut., Ter., Catull., Prop.

sublucidus should not be asterisked; it is found also in Amm., Porph., Cassiod.

talarius ludus: 'a gaming-house for dice-playing'; the reader will do better to turn to Georges.

tentamen: 'perhaps only in the two following passages'; a third example is in Ov. *M.* XIII. 19, and there is a fourth in Augustine.

tumulosus should not be asterisked; it is found also in Amm., Prud., Ven. Fort.

uastito is omitted; Amm. XVI. 4. 4 and XXVI. 5. 9.

G. B. A. FLETCHER.

University of Liverpool.

DIRECTION-POSTS ON ROMAN ROADS?

'VIAM feci ab Regio ad Capuam et in ea via ponteis omneis miliarios *tabellariosque* posivei'.—Thus the consul P. Popilius (132 B.C.) commemorated the construction of a new arterial road connecting Rome with Sicily.¹ What were the *tabellarii* with which he equipped it?

The ordinary meaning of *tabellarius* is messenger. Accordingly Miss A. M. Ramsay has made the important suggestion that Popilius instituted a postal service between Rome and one of its provinces, thus anticipating the well-known *cursus publicus* of the emperor Augustus.² In support of this theory she points out that in 132 B.C. Sicily was the scene of a serious servile insurrection, which engaged considerable Roman forces and no doubt necessitated a frequent interchange of dispatches between the governing proconsul and the Senate.

Another reason why the consulate of Popilius might be regarded as an opportune moment for inaugurating a *cursus publicus* in Italy was that Scipio Aemilianus had recently returned from a tour of inspection in Egypt, and that he had no doubt brought back information

about the postal service of the Ptolemaic dynasty.³

On the other hand it is strange that Popilius' inscription should be the only text of republican times in which reference is made to an official messenger-service, such as is here put to the credit of the consul of 132 B.C. A *cursus publicus* must have been of such obvious advantage that, once established, it could hardly have failed to be maintained, and even to be extended to other Roman high-roads. But if the Roman state-post remained in operation, it is difficult to understand why no mention of it occurs in Cicero, or why Suetonius described Augustus' messenger-service as a new departure.⁴

Moreover, we may hesitate to accept the construction which this theory

¹ On the Ptolemaic state-post, see Grenfell and Hunt, *The Hibeh Papyri*, no. 110. The date of Scipio's visit was probably 135 B.C. (Bouché-Leclercq, *Histoire des Lagides*, vol. II, p. 68, n. 1).

² Miss Ramsay suggests that the discontinuance of Popilius' postal service was due to the notorious remissness of the government of the late Republic. But this government had everything to gain by keeping the provincial commanders under its control, and a *cursus publicus* was plainly an effective means to that end. It is hardly credible that the Senate should have been so blind to its own interests as Miss Ramsay assumes.

³ *C.I.L.* I, pt. 2, no. 638; Dessau, *Inscr. Lat. Sel.*, no. 23.

⁴ *Journ. Rom. Stud.*, 1920, pp. 79-86.

places upon the words of Popilius: 'I laid bridges and milestones, and I instituted a postal service'. Since *pontes*, *miliarii* and *tabelarii* are all governed by the same verb, *posivei*, they presumably denote objects of like nature; and the conjunction *-que*, which Popilius used in preference to *et* in order to link *miliarii* and *tabelarii* together, indicates that these were species of the same genus. It is therefore hazardous to assume that the *tabelarii* had powers of locomotion—more probably they were fixtures like the *pontes* and the *miliarii*, and served a similar purpose to that of the *miliarii*.

An alternative explanation has been offered by Hirschfeld, who suggests that the *tabelarii* were milestones which differed from the *miliarii* in that their lettering was not chiselled into the grain of the stone, but was cut into a tablet affixed to their surface.¹ *Tabellae* of wood or of bronze, being easier to engrave than stone, would presumably be used where the inscription was of more than ordinary length.

This theory is grammatically unimpeachable, and it derives apparent support from the fact that milestones with tablets affixed were to be found not infrequently on Roman roads. Yet the very stone on which Popilius' inscription is carved cries out against Hirschfeld's explanation. Its complete text, which contains a detailed record of Popilius' various consular activities, amounts to no less than 68 words in

all; indeed it is one of the longest surviving inscriptions of this class. Yet it was engraved on a *miliarius*, not on a *tabelarius* (in Hirschfeld's sense).

A third alternative may therefore be suggested here, that the noun to be supplied with *tabelarios* is not *lapides* but *stipites*, i.e., that the *tabelarii* were direction-posts with wooden arms (*tabellae*). It is true that no such posts have survived to our time; but if they were made of timber, their disappearance was only to be expected. That information about road-branchings was given to ancient wayfarers is proved by a passage from Strabo in which the road-system of the Hindu emperor Chandragupta is described: *ὁδοποιοῦσι δὲ καὶ κατὰ δέκα στάδια στήλην τιθέασιν τὰς ἐκτροπὰς καὶ τὰ διαστήματα δηλοῦσαν*.² In this instance the side-roads apparently were not marked at the actual forking, but on the nearest milestone. But it is hardly too rash to assume that the more convenient device of erecting direction-boards at the actual turning-off points suggested itself in due course, and became known to the Romans, if it was not actually invented by them.³

M. CARY.

University of London.

² XV. 1. 50, p. 708 (on the authority of Megasthenes, an eye-witness).

³ It is conceivable that Chandragupta's *στήλαι* became known to the Mediterranean world through the medium of the Hellenistic Greeks, among whom Megasthenes found many readers. But the Romans were quite capable of inventing direction-posts for themselves.

¹ *Kleine Schriften*, pp. 708-9.

PLATO, *REP.* 389D.

Φέρε δὴ, ἦν δ' ἐγώ, πῶς ἡ πόλις ἀρκέσει ἐπὶ τοσαύτῃ παρασκευῇ; ἄλλο τι γεωργὸς μὲν εἰς, ὁ δὲ οἰκοδόμος, ἄλλος δὲ τις ὑφάντης; ἡ καὶ σκντοτόμος αὐτόσε προσθήσμενος ἦτιν' ἄλλον τῶν περὶ τὸ σῶμα θεραπευτήν; —Πάνυ γε—Εἴη δ' ἂν ἡ γε ἀναγκαῖοτάτη πόλις ἐκ τεττάρων ἢ πέντε ἀνδρῶν.—φαίνεται.

Πῶς ἡ πόλις ἀρκέσει κ.τ.λ. is awkward in more ways than one; but it is perhaps sufficient to put it like this: Socrates asks a question, to which he himself suggests the answer; that answer is, substantially, 'four or five,' which is not an answer to πῶς. I suggest πῶση for πῶς ἡ.

The last letter which I received from the late A. E. Housman consisted, substantially, of ten words; the last three were 'I like πῶση.'

R. W. CHAPMAN.

Magdalen College, Oxford.

AN EMENDATION OF LEONIDAS OF TARENTUM.

Anth. Pal. VII 472 ll. 7-12:

ἐκ τοιῆς ὠνθρωποι ἀπηκριβωμένοι δατῶν
ἀρμονίης διφῶσ' ἥρα καὶ νεφέλας·
ῶνερ, ἰδ' ὡς ἀχρεῖον· ἐπεὶ περὶ νήματος ἄκρον
εὐλὴ ἀκέραιστον λῶπος ἐφεζομένη
οἶον ἢ τοφθαλθριον ἀπεψιλωμένον οἶον,
πολλὸν ἀραρχαῖον στιγνότερον σκελετοῦ.

τοφθαλθριον has caused much bewilderment. Paton is probably right in picking out the word θριον. A reference to a withered leaf is quite suitable.

Or are we confronted by an unknown word? Bevan suspects a *ἄπαξ λεγόμενον* whose meaning is unknown to us, but his suggestion of a sloughed snake-skin does not appear to fit the context unless we introduce further changes.

Stadtmueller thought of a word from Hesychius, *λάθαργος*, signifying (1) a worm; (2) a scraping of leather. He conjectured (in his critical notes) *θουνᾶτ' αἶψα λάθαργον*. But neither a worm nor a scrap of leather goes well with *ἀπεψιλωμένον*. In his text he prints *θουνᾶτ' αἶψα λαθρηδὸν ἀπεψιλωμένον, οἶον, κτλ.* This emendation puts *οἶον* in a very strange position. Bevan sees that the double *οἶον* is probably wrong. It does not help much to change one of them to *οἶον*. Hecker had a good idea in proposing *δοτεῦν* for the second *οἶον*. It is strange that no one has thought of *αὖον* as a further epithet for *θρίον*.

But I think a more vigorous process of emendation is required, for the following reasons. Although the order of the lines of this epigram is doubtful (see Stadtmueller's critical notes), lines 7-16 seem to be linked up together, and a pause at *ἐφεζομένη* is awkward. The metaphor

which begins in lines 9-10 should be continued in the following couplet. I would therefore emend as follows:

ὤνερ, τῷ δ' ὡς ἀχρεῖον, ἐπεὶ περὶ νήματος ἄκρον
εὐλὴ ἀκέραιστον λῶπος ἐφεζομένη,
οἶον τε ψῆν θρίον, ἀποψιλοῖ μίτον δστῶν,
πολλὸν ἀραχναίου στηγνύτερον σκελετοῦ.

This emendation may appear somewhat violent at first sight. But a reference to the maggot called *ψῆν* fits in well with *θρίον*, for the *ψῆν* feeds upon fig-trees (Ar. *Birds* 590). *ἀποψιλοῖ μίτον δστῶν* is an effort to finish off the metaphor while supplying a suitable activity for the *εὐλή*, which in many previous emendations appears to be left syntactically and practically unemployed.

R. A. BROWNE.

University College, Bangor.

REVIEWS

GREEK LYRIC POETRY.

C. M. BOWRA: *Greek Lyric Poetry from Alcman to Simonides*. Pp. viii + 490. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1936. Cloth, 21s.

SINCE 1922-8, when these fragments, first collected long before by Bergk, were added to the *Loeb Library* with the necessary textual revisions and additions as well as the testimonia, biographica, etc., and a complete translation, the writing of such a book as this has become natural, desirable, and in some respects comparatively easy. It is fortunate that the task has fallen into competent hands. For though many faults, not all trifling, occur in Mr. Bowra's book, future expounders of the Melic Fragments must take it very seriously into account. Where, as here, judgments of poets and their work must be based on scrappy evidence, to be of any value they must be made soberly and sympathetically. The imagination must neither be allowed to run amok nor be put in a strait-waist-coat. Scepticism always wins the applause of the half-informed; exegesis, like textual criticism, is an art, not a science; and it is not every handler of these 'jewels five-words long' that has treated them as they deserve. Mr. Bowra is generally both sober and sympathetic.

The Introduction I find the least satisfactory part of the book. Like many before him, Mr. Bowra skates lightly over the thin ice of matters musical. What, for instance, does he mean, on p. 3, by 'a recitative intoned to a simple accompaniment'? A monotone which ignored the pitch accent? If so, it at least needed discussion. And his statement on p. 10 that Greek music 'was almost entirely a matter of tune' is surely disproved by the very existence of the elaborate lyric metres. Before the invention of harmony—in the modern technical sense—the narrowness of the tonal scope must have been a prime factor in the development of the elaborate rhythms. The natural craving for variety, checked in the use of tune both by the strength of tradition and by what to our musicians would appear an incomplete virtuosity, found its outlet in time. And yet this rhythmic exuberance was—at any rate 'before the war'—the restrained, conservative, reasoned exuberance of old Greece, and to believe that the epode differed from strophe and antistrophe merely for variety (p. 10) is, I think, to misunderstand the Greek spirit. Again, Mr. Bowra shows a wide knowledge of Greek ritual, though indeed some readers will wonder at his identi-

fiying, without discussion, Apollo with the Sun as early as the sixth century (p. 135); yet he seems to read modern notions into Greek religion both when he makes it the vehicle of ethical teaching ('such maxims were for the Greeks an integral part of the religious life'¹), and when he implies that the Greeks as a whole would have thought it wrong, shall we say, to laugh in church ('if Alcman's manner [in the *Partheneion*] seems unduly familiar for a religious occasion, that is only because he interprets the festival as the right time for gaiety'²). Another fault I see in this chapter is its inadequate discussion of origins and connexions. It contains no hint that the Epinikion was a special type of the Enkomion or Song-in-the-Kṓmos; yet Archilochus' *τῆγελλα καλλίνικε*, which began life as a Hymn to Herakles and ended as an Epinikion, was sung by a *χορὸς κομαστών*.³ And the iambic and trochaic element in early Greek song is passed over almost in silence; yet melic—a word which for some reason Mr. Bowra avoids—came to mean tune-poetry, iambs are known to have been sung, and at least one of the great melic poets had a Book of iambs to his name.

Further on, the skill Mr. Bowra shows in presenting historical and cultural backgrounds gives permanent value to some of the chapters, notably those on the *Drinking-Songs* and Alcman. The treatment of the *Partheneion*, exegetically, marks an advance. True, it seems to me impossible to divide the song between semi-choruses—here Mr. Bowra follows in the main Mr. Sheppard and others who forget where the poem stands in the history of the triad⁴—but the novel and

in some ways surprising suggestion that it was performed by the Leukippides at a joint feast of Dionysus and Helen is well worked out—though perhaps it would have been better to stop at the top of p. 47, instead of trying to account for the association of Dionysus with Helen or of Helen with the Dawn. Aotis would become the nickname of any Goddess worshipped in a *παννυχίς*, and Dionysus is enough to account for that.⁵ Textually—and I must take his treatment of this poem as typical, which it is—Mr. Bowra's work leaves much to be desired. I find him too ready to admit readings to which, if he could bring himself to use his own judgment instead of indulging an indiscriminating respect for foreign scholars some of whom do not understand Greek poetry so well as he does, he would prefer lections more consonant with the palaeographical facts, the teachings of comparative philology, and, be it said, his own fine literary taste.⁶ In l. 13 *ἄνδρας οὐ* is too long, and in 19 *ἦνιδ* too short for the space; in 49 *ὑποπετριδίων* is an impossible form of *ὑποπεριδίων*; in 15 we must read *ἀπέδιλος ἄλκα*, not *ἄλκα*, to make a complete sentence. And there are more serious blemishes: at l. 61 *ὀρθρίαι* is translated as if it came between article and noun,⁷ at 98 the preposition *ἀντί* is rendered 'against,' and at 56 *διαφάδαν τί τοι λέγω*; is translated 'what can I say to make it clear?' (For mistranslation and misconception in other chapters see e.g. p. 170, where *κάλην* infinitive is taken as *κάλαν* adjective, and this despite the scholion there quoted; and p. 143, where the 'emphatic' *βασιλεύων* is said to be 'reduced to impotence' by being removed from the end of a sentence to the beginning—the old fault of thinking that Greek and

¹ P. 11; see also the last sentence of the same page.

² P. 12.

³ Eratosthenes ap. Sch. Pind. *Ol.* 9.

⁴ The theory involves change of speakers in the middle of a line. *ἐγὼν μὲν . . . ἐγὼν δέ*, ll. 85-7, is the only really plausible argument in their favour, and it is by no means conclusive; cf. Xen. *An.* 7. 7. 42 *πλουτεῖ μὲν ὄντων φίλων πολλῶν, πλουτεῖ δὲ καὶ ἄλλων βουλομένων γενέσθαι*, Soph. *Phil.* 633 *πάντα λεκτά, πάντα δὲ τολμητά*, Eur. *Med.* 99 *μήτηρ κινεῖ κραδίαν, κινεῖ δὲ χόλον*, H.F. 65 ff. *ἔχων . . . ἔχων δέ . . .* (Kühn.-Gerth

ii. 2. 273), Hom. *Od.* 12. 189 *ἴθμεν . . . ἴθμεν δέ . . .*, Hom. *H.* Dem. 229 *οἶδα . . . οἶδα δέ . . .*

⁵ Similarly *Ἀγησιχόρα* is surely a nickname.

⁶ Diehl, useful man, is only a compiler, and the emendations and supplements he prints are often ludicrous.

⁷ The ancient variant *ὀρθραῖ* read as *ὀρθρα* is not necessarily unmetrical (p. 42); inscriptions spell it *-ia* and *-ea* as well as *-eia* and *-uia*, and in any case both *ei* and *ai* would easily scan short before a vowel.

Latin emphasized by putting last like English.) On pp. 33 and 67 the reader is led to suppose that *Αἶσα* is not personified by Homer. It is true, Aristarchus obelized *Il.* 20. 127¹; yet if Mr. Bowra follows him and also rejects *Od.* 7. 197,² a note was surely required. And in the same passages we are not warned that *πόρος* and *σιῶν*, both essential to the argument, are modern. Similarly, on p. 32, we should have been more clearly told that 'him did Polydeukes slay' involves a supplement—which, by the way, cannot be right because it does not fit.³ On p. 35 we read 'Pindar and Bacchylides show no signs of it [division of parts in Greek choral poetry]'; yet Bacch. xvii. consists of four strophes, two spoken by Aegeus and two by the chorus-leader. On p. 49 support is found for a connexion between Helen and the Dawn in the 'abruptness' with which Theocritus introduces a Dawn-simile for Helen, *Hel.* 26; yet he shows the same abruptness in the almost identically constructed simile of the mother-swallow at 14. 39. This is surely another old fault, that of seeing only what you want to see. (For similar forcing of evidence in a later chapter see the 'double meaning' of *ἐπέεατο* on p. 326; *ἐπέεατ' ἑλθών* is hardly the same as *πεξάμενος ἦλθεν*.)

Mr. Bowra's portraits, like his backgrounds, are well done—the gaiety of Alcman, the passionateness of Sappho and Ibycus, the worldliness of Anacreon, the pathos of Simonides, the savage directness of Alcaeus, even the elusive Homericotatism of Stesichorus; indeed

they seem to me, next perhaps to the excellent Appendix on the Ovidian *Sappho Phaoni*, to be the best things in the book. His analysis of their respective styles I find less successful—sometimes too detailed considering the scantiness of the material; not all these poets reveal themselves and their ways in a few scattered phrases like Sappho. And there are times when he analyses the beauty of a passage without telling us that the reading is greatly in doubt, for instance *πρὸ γόων* and *οἶκτος* in the *Thermopylae Dirge* (p. 364). This argues, I think, a failure to realize practical conditions; and the same turn of mind is betrayed in another way. In dealing with fragments like these, *experto crede*, it is no use to leave textual matters to the German editors and the professed papyrologists. You must take off your coat and do the thing yourself. An appendix of his own emendations—few considering how much material there is—of which some are well worthy of consideration, shows what Mr. Bowra might have done. But these are rare exceptions; and it may well be that it is the general impression he gives of being willing to let others do some of his work for him, more than the actual mistakes and misapprehensions to be found in it, that makes a perhaps too conscientious reviewer mark his book *alpha*, not *alpha plus*.⁴

J. M. EDMONDS.

Cambridge.

⁴ Some of Mr. Bowra's translations I find remarkably familiar, e.g. a long passage about a donkey on p. 320; but I forgive him. I confess I feel rather less generous towards his statement on p. 448 that my supplement *καὶ δῶαν*, in Sappho's *Nereid Ode*, leaves the *μήδεις* of the next line 'practically without meaning.' It does, with Blass's egregious [*μηκέτι μ' ἤδεις*, but not with my [*δόσκλεα μ' ἤδεις*, i.e. *δόσκλεα* taken as predicate with *γένοιτο δ' ἄμμι*. And, by the way, the new alternative to *καὶ δῶαν* is much too long. In his second edition Mr. Bowra will doubtless correct certain misaccentuations and one or two curious slips, e.g. *γρυπές* for *γρύπες* on p. 51, *καὶ φορταί* on p. 37, l. 70, *διὰ φορταί* on p. 24, and *γρόση* for *γρόφοι* on p. 318, the first and last repeated in the Index; and Stesichorus must have called his poem *Ἑλένα*, not *Ἑλένη*.

¹ ὅστερον αὖτε τὰ πείσεται ἄσσα οἱ Αἶσα | γεγρομένῃ ἐπένησε λίνφ, ὅτε μιν τέκε μήτηρ.

² ἔνθα δ' ἔπειτα | πείσεται ἄσσα οἱ Αἶσα κατὰ Κλωθῆς τε βαρεῖαι (Eustath. cit. κατακλώθησι βαρεῖα) | γενομένην ἤσαντο λίνφ, ὅτε μιν τέκε μήτηρ.

³ The *Parthenion* was unlucky in being discovered as early as 1855, when, as indeed for long after, the importance of the accurate measurement of spaces was not recognized; and thus the guesses of the earlier editors have been too readily perpetuated. The same is, or rather was, true of the great Bacchylides Papyrus; Jebb printed 160 supplements verifiable by measurement; of these 31 are demonstrably wrong and 11 doubtful.

THE PERSIANS IN ENGLISH PROSE.

The *Persians* of Aeschylus translated by T. G. TUCKER, C.M.G., Litt.D. Pp. 43. Melbourne: University Press (London: Milford), 1935. Cloth, 3s. 6d.

THIS is the third in the series of Professor Tucker's prose translations of Aeschylus; like the earlier two it is dignified, clear, and reasonably close to the original. It is a less discouraging task to state in English prose what Aeschylus was saying in the *Persae* than in the *Agamemnon*, and where the text is doubtful Professor Tucker adopts a sensibly conservative version, with alternative suggestions kept to a bare minimum in the notes. Some points of doubt or disagreement inevitably arise: what Greek word are we to imagine in 559 as the original of 'double-fledged' ships, or in 815 (an admittedly puzzling metaphor and dubious text) for the 'ground-work of disasters is not yet laid, but still grows stone by stone'? In 163 *κονίσας οὐδας*, however interpreted, should hardly be translated 'in its headlong haste'; and in 829 it is surprising to find the reading *σωφρονεῖν κεχρημένοι* apparently defended as meaning 'using sane judgment'. In 76 *διχόθεν* is surely better taken with *πεποιθώς*, as proleptic of *πεζονόμοις ἐκ τε θαλάσσης*, rather than with *ἐλαύνει*. Is Darius's list of Persian kings (765-7)

headed by 'a Mede' and 'another Mede' (*Μῆδος* and *ἄλλος*), or is 'Medos' not rather an eponymous ancestor, with 'second' to him a son whose name (perhaps Artaphrenes) is punningly alluded to in 767?

The introduction is very brief, and it would be merely querulous to complain of omissions. Perhaps one may grudge the paragraph allotted to a rather superficial discussion of Atossa's ignorance in asking 'Where is Athens?' and wish there had been instead a reference to Phrynichus or to the paintings of Polygnotus. Controversial questions are avoided, so the stage-scene is simply given as 'in front of the Council Chamber at Susa'. If however this reasonable interpretation of the *στέγος ἀρχαῖον* is adopted, it is still very doubtful whether *ἐνεζόμενοι* in 140 can be translated 'let us go sit within this venerable hall and take counsel'. *ἐνέζομαι* with the accusative is to sit *on*, not to sit *inside* a place: the Chorus is saying in effect 'let us sit down and hold a council-meeting', probably suiting the action to the word—on the steps. The scene is here in fact, as Wilamowitz (*Aesch. Int.*, p. 49) points out, reminiscent of the *Phoenissae* of Phrynichus.

A. M. DALE.

Lady Margaret Hall, Oxford.

AN INTRODUCTION TO SOPHOCLES.

T. B. L. WEBSTER: *An Introduction to Sophocles*. Pp. 210. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1936. Cloth, 12s. 6d.

THIS is a valuable and scholarly work. Professor Webster modestly calls it an 'introduction' to Sophocles, but it is much more than that, and the reader who does not know his Sophocles by heart will do well to read with a text beside him, and consult it frequently. If he does so, he will find by the time that he reaches the end that his knowledge of Sophocles has been clarified and extended. Professor Webster knows his Sophocles intimately and is almost equally familiar with the modern literature on the subject, and his work shows

not only knowledge but sane judgement. He is not maintaining a thesis, but sets out to tell clearly what is to be known about Sophocles. He deals in successive chapters with the Life of Sophocles (including the chronology of the extant plays), with 'Thought,' 'Characters,' 'Character Drawing' (i.e. the technical devices for the display of character), 'Plot Construction,' 'Song,' and 'Style.' All these chapters are full of matter, but the reader will sometimes regret that the writer, with so much to say, has not allowed himself more space, for further illustration and comment would help: for example, the value of certain points in the earlier chapters is

not apparent till we find that they are to be used in an appendix for the dating of the fragments.

When there is so much solid matter, one can only select a few points. In the *Life of Sophocles* the author lays stress on his association with the aristocratic circles of Athens, and finds in his thought the old aristocratic ideals, and in accord with this an enlightened conservatism in matters of religion; and these points are worked out and illustrated later in the interpretation of the plays. In the discussion of plot he lays stress on Sophocles' interest in character, and makes some interesting points: e.g. on p. 85, 'Sophocles displays his characters by contrasting them with other characters, Euripides by the situation which he makes them face...' But he perhaps goes too far when he says (p. 88) that he 'constructs his whole play of character contrasts'; for even in the tabulated list of character contrasts which he appends some of the contrasts are of situation rather than of character. But he is clear and convincing when he traces the development in Sophocles' methods of displaying character and its influence on the choice of plot, and he well maintains against some interpreters (pp. 101 ff.) that Sophocles wrote for readers as well as for the stage.

The chapter on 'Style' contains a careful analysis of the diction, showing the change from the Aeschylean to a simpler style. But though this change is undoubted and manifest, some of the instances cited are naturally disputable: e.g. one cannot safely class as Aeschylean such a familiar legal term as *aikeia*. This is not unimportant,

for the use of this criterion in the appendix on the chronology of the fragments results in putting more of the plays early than one would naturally expect. Rhythm and structure of sentences and order of words are likewise tests of date in the case of Sophocles, but of these less is said, and in the case of short fragments such tests are doubtless hard to apply. If some of the other tests applied are open to question, this comes from the nature of the case: in the dearth of evidence we must be thankful for what we can get.

A work of such scope naturally provokes some disagreement, and we may suggest a few cavils. Homer's Athena, as we find her in the *Odyssey*, hardly needed to be 'moralized' by Sophocles, as suggested on p. 20. 'The Fates,' we read on p. 26, 'have lost their position as independent and ancient powers.' It would be hard to say when they held it, and it was certainly not Sophocles who dethroned them. Again the passage quoted on p. 27 hardly justifies the statement that the belief that the gods derive sustenance from sacrifice 'survives' in Aeschylus. And not everyone will agree with the writer, though he expresses himself cautiously (p. 96), that Ajax is sincere in his profession of repentance.

These are small points. The lack of a bibliography is more serious. Many writers are cited in footnotes, and without a bibliography references to *op. cit.* are tiresome to a reader with only a normal memory. Misprints are few, but *parodos* several times figures as *parados*, and 'Lycaean lord' p. 127 for *Λύκει' ἄναξ*.

F. R. EARP.

TYPICAL NUMBERS.

J. W. S. BLOM: *De typische Getallen bij Homeros en Herodotos. I. Triaden, Hebdomaden en Enneaden*. Pp. xii+316. Nijmegen: Berkhout, 1936. Paper.

IN all traditional narrative, and not least in Greek epic, certain numbers (for the most part sacred or 'limit' numbers) are freely used to signify no more than 'few' or 'many', or as a regular ele-

ment in a story (e.g., the innumerable old men in *märchen* who have three sons, heroines who have seven brothers, and so on). Three, seven and nine are very common in this use; and since Homer takes them over from popular narrative and Herodotos is influenced alike by Homer and by folk-tradition, it follows that when such figures occur in the History we must be on our guard

and not take, without enquiry, a merely 'typical' number as if it were an exact piece of statistical information. Hence this very diligent piece of research, submitted by its author as a doctoral thesis at the Catholic University of Nijmegen, justifies its existence.

Dr. Blom has been very methodical and the material is classified elaborately, at the cost of a certain amount of repetition of examples under different headings; he takes the threes first, then the sevens and nines, and in each case begins with Homer and goes on to Herodotos, putting the express mentions of the numbers first and then the 'latent' usages, i.e., those passages in which something happens three, seven or nine times, or a like number of persons or places are mentioned, without

the numbers themselves being named (contrast, for instance, Hippokleides' three dances in Hdt. vi. 129, 3, *πρῶτα μὲν . . . μετὰ δὲ . . . τὸ τρίτον δὲ*, with the three stages of Demaratos' flight in vi. 70, 2). In all, he finds 173 'explicit' (*genoemde*) triads in Herodotos, 106 being 'typical', while of the 'latent' triads two-thirds are 'typical'; for sevens the proportions are respectively two-thirds and one half, for nines, which are rare, about half are 'typical'. The reviewer has noted several disagreements, and indeed it is hardly to be expected that in such a matter any two lists should exactly agree; but Dr. Blom seems to have made out his case in general.

H. J. ROSE.

University of St. Andrews.

ZENO OF ELEA.

H. D. P. LEE: *Zeno of Elea*. Pp. vi+125. (Cambridge Classical Studies, I.) Cambridge: University Press, 1936. Cloth, 7s. 6d.

THIS is the first volume of a series in which it is designed to issue from time to time works of classical research which are too long for journals and too short for independent books. The Cambridge Press is to be congratulated on an enterprise which makes possible the publication in so attractive a form of studies which might otherwise never see the light.

Mr. Lee has collected all the passages of importance which deal with the arguments of Zeno, and edited them with a translation and commentary. In this he sets himself austere limits; his aim is merely to expound the actual meaning of his author and to give some account of his place in the history of Greek philosophy, and he eschews any attempt to solve the puzzles which Zeno set or even to review the solutions of others: Aristotle himself is confined to the task of explanation, and his criticism is ignored.

The *Physics* is the chief source for our knowledge of Zeno's arguments; Mr. Lee's collection of passages differs from Diels', the most extensive hitherto made, in the inclusion of more excerpts

from the Aristotelian commentators; Simplicius is quoted always, Philoponus frequently, and the paraphrase of Themistius occasionally. The relevant passages are divided into four parts, each followed by its section of commentary, and dealing respectively with plurality, place, motion, and the millet-seed. Of these the first and third are naturally the most important. The book ends with a discussion of Zeno's claim to be the founder of dialectic in the sense defined by Aristotle in the *Topics*.

The translation is clear and accurate, and the commentary provides a sensible and lucid explanation of the text without startling novelties. The conclusion is rightly drawn that sense can only be made of the plurality argument by supposing that it is directed against a view which failed to distinguish the characteristics of point, unit, and atom, and thus involved itself in the inconsistent assumptions of infinite divisibility and of indivisibles. This view is identified with the 'number-atomism' of the younger Pythagoreans, as it was by Milhaud and Tannery, and Mr. Lee goes on to contend that the four arguments on motion, of which two, the dichotomy and the Achilles, rest on the assumption of infinite divisibility, and

two, the flying arrow and the stadium, on the assumption of indivisibles, are directed against the same theory. Here he is on more doubtful ground, though his argument is ingenious and interesting, and the symmetry which he points out in the four puzzles finds at least an illustration in the antinomies of the *Parmenides*.

I add a few detailed criticisms. On p. 68 the dichotomy is said probably to assume the infinite divisibility of time as well as space. That it did not, seems to be shown at *Phys.* 263a18-22, where Aristotle admits that his refutation of Zeno at 233a21 ff. is only valid *ad hominem*. At p. 50 l. 4 it seems unnecessary to read *βραδύτατον* for

βραδύτερον, which is in fact what Mr. Lee translates, whereas at l. 7 he gives 'slowest' for *βραδύτερον*. At p. 52 l. 5 *εἶναι* is omitted after *φερομένην*. On p. 28 *ad fin.* 19A20 should be 19A29.

Dr. Ross's edition of the *Physics* came out too late for Mr. Lee to use it. They are in general agreement, but Mr. Lee rejects Dr. Ross's ingenious interpretation of τὸ μέσον at the beginning of the stadium puzzle and retains Simplicius' explanation. It should be mentioned that at *Phys.* 240a13 Dr. Ross now reads not τὸ B but τὸ πρῶτον B, as does Mr. Lee following Professor Cornford.

W. HAMILTON.

Eton College, Windsor.

THE PROGRAMME OF THUCYDIDES.

AUGUST GROSSKINSKY: *Das Programm des Thukydides*. Pp. 108. Berlin: Junker und Dünhaupt, 1936. Paper, RM. 5.

FOR some years Professor Otto Regenbogen's seminar at Heidelberg has interested itself in Thucydides. We already owe to him H. Münch's competent *Studien zu den Exkursen des T.* (Heidelberg 1935), as well as his own *T. als politischer Denker* (Hum. Gymn. 1933, 2-25). Now Grosskinsky, author of a note on Hdt. 4, 187 in *Hermes* 1931, analyses 1, 22 in the context of chs. 20-22.

The incompatibility of T.'s theory and practice in speech-writing has long been a problem. Schwartz dismissed 1, 22, 1 as a 'literary fiction'; Pohlenz used it as a touchstone to distinguish 'early' speeches which agreed with it from 'late' which did not; Schadewaldt constructed from it the early, 'sophistic' T., who only later evolved into a historian in the fullest sense. G. attempts to remove the incompatibility itself. He argues, at dreadful length, that *ξύμπασα γνώμη* is 'upshot,' not 'tenour'; that the vagueness of *ὅσα λόγῳ εἶπον* and *τῶν ἀληθῶς λεχθέντων* is intended to cover the welding of several actual speeches into one of T.; that the treatment of *λόγοι* is stated in antithesis to that of *ἔργα*, T. claiming for the former a limited subjectivity in

contrast to the complete objectivity of the latter; and that *τὰ μέλλοντά ποτε αἰθῆς κτλ.*, though future for T., is *present* for his readers (*οἱ βουλήσονται κτλ.*), so that the history is *ὠφέλιμον* in that it (p. 79) 'gibt die Möglichkeit, ähnliches Geschehen seiner eigenen Gegenwart (*τῶν μελλόντων . . . ἔσεσθαι*) in seinen Kausalzusammenhängen zu begreifen (*τὸ σαφὲς σκοπεῖν*).¹ To attain such an end, maintains G., the *λόγοι* as well as the *ἔργα* (for both are included in *αὐτά*) must have been intended in no mere documentary sense.

Thus finding 1, 22, 1 consonant with all, or nearly all, the speeches, G. proceeds to date 'late' (about 404) the chapters 20-22, which (after Schadewaldt) he shows to be united by verbal resumptives of 21 in 22 and by community of subject. But all G.'s arguments, true or false, miss the essential difficulty. However little *ἡ ξύμπασα γνώμη* represents, a promise to keep *ὅτι ἐγγύτατα τῆς ξ. γ. τῶν ἀληθῶς λεχθέντων* implies that there were always *ἀληθῶς λεχθέντα* of which the ξ. γ. could be ascertained; but who will assert that of the Athenians

¹ This suggestion, the only real novelty which G. offers, is untenable despite the analogy of 2, 48, 3: it strains *τὸ σαφὲς σκοπεῖν*, and if T. did not mean *τῶν μελλόντων* to be future in relation to his readers as well as to himself, he expressed his meaning with criminal obscurity. The passage is correctly explained by Shilleto.

at Sparta, of the Melian dialogue, of the speeches at Camarina? None of T.'s protagonists can really be claimed to speak *ὡς περὶ τῶν παρόντων τὰ δέοντα* *μάλιστα* *ἂν εἶπον*,¹ though the degree to which dramatic probability is violated varies—a variation which Pohlenz and Schadewaldt attempt to account for. We must guard against supposing

¹ G. passes lightly over this clause: he appears (pp. 40, 99) to interpret *τὰ δέοντα* as said from the standpoint of Thucydides, which I think impossible.

that T. was necessarily as conscious as ourselves of the gulf between his programme and his practice; but it is more natural that such a programme was formulated before than after the speeches themselves were created. T. makes another such premature undertaking in 5, 26, 1.

The book itself, one of the series *Neue deutsche Forschungen*, is well printed and tastefully produced.

J. ENOCH POWELL.

Trinity College, Cambridge.

DEMOSTHENES IN THE LOEB LIBRARY.

Demosthenes *against Meidias, Androtion, Aristocrates, Timocrates, Aristogeiton*. With an English translation by J. H. VINCE. Pp. vii + 597. (Loeb Classical Library.) London: Heinemann, 1935. Cloth, 10s. (leather, 12s. 6d.).

THE speeches contained in the second volume of Mr. Vince's translation of Demosthenes are for the most part those in which the orator is not at his best. Apart from a few great passages in the other five speeches (two of which are wrongly attributed to him), it is only in the *Meidias* that his characteristic qualities come out strongly, and the translator's task is generally a rather weary one. It is not Mr. Vince's fault that, if an enquirer who wished to discover why Demosthenes was regarded as a great orator were referred to this volume, he might not be easy to satisfy. The translation is workmanlike and generally very accurate; the few passages criticized below must be regarded as quite exceptional. It must never be forgotten that the orator depended largely on his delivery for his effect, and delivered with the skill of a Demosthenes the translation would probably not come out badly. The relatively few slips (or what seem to be such) which the reviewer has noticed may be grouped under a few heads:

(1) *Technical terms etc.* *καταχειροτονία* (*Meid.* §§ 6, 16 etc.) is rather a 'vote of censure' than a 'verdict' or 'conviction'. In *Meid.* § 17 *τὰ δημόσια* 'public thoroughfares' is misleading of the *παρασκηνία*: better, 'he nailed them up, public property though they were,

and he a private citizen'. In *Meid.* § 26 *ἐν ὑμῖν* is not 'in your court', but 'in your assembly', as *πρόεδρον* shows. In *Androt.* § 1 *τῇ πόλει* is rendered 'constitution' (= *πολιτεία*) where no constitutional question is involved; and similarly in § 43 *ὡς ἀδικοῦσί τινες τὴν πόλιν* is rendered by 'violating the constitution' instead of simply 'an offence against the State'; non-payment of taxes is not an attack on the constitution. In *Timocr.* § 55 etc. the *προσ-* *προστιμᾶσθαι* is generally neglected.

(2) *Grammar and idiom.* *Meid.* § 8 *εἰ ἄρα* is rendered by 'if perhaps any of you hitherto assumed': but *εἰ ἄρα* always marks the alternative which the speaker regards as unlikely or impossible;—'if any of you has ever really believed'. In *Meid.* § 58 *δήπου* is not 'for instance', but 'as you know', and in § 143 not 'assuredly', but 'you will understand'. There are a number of places in which the present is unnecessarily rendered by a past tense, sometimes sacrificing the generality of the sense, e.g. *Meid.* § 57 *λαμβάνοντα*, § 126 *παράλειπω*, *Androt.* § 19 *ἀδικούντων*, § 51 *εἰσπράττειν*. In *Timocr.* § 112 there is the reverse mistake, *μάλ' ἀκριβῶς εὔρεν* being rendered by 'is at great pains to invent', instead of 'has devised with great precision', and in § 58 *ἐψηφίσθαι* is treated as a present. In the *Androtion* (§ 8 and other places) no attention is paid to the fact that *ποιεῖσθαι τριήρεις* is not quite the same as *ποιεῖν τριήρεις*. In *Androt.* § 16 *τοῦτον ὅρον τεθείκασι* is rendered as if it were *τοῦτον τὸν ὅρον*.

(3) *Vocabulary*. Perhaps the translator does not recognize sufficiently the special shades of meaning in Demosthenes' terms of abuse. Thus in *Meid.* § 2 we have *θρασύν* rendered 'scoundrel' and *βδελυρόν* (here and elsewhere) 'ruffian'. (In § 98 and other places it is translated 'blackguard'.) In *Meid.* § 209 *βάσκανον* should be 'the malignant', rather than 'the knave', and *δλεθρον* 'the pest', rather than 'the sorry rascal': and in *Timocr.* § 10 *θεοῖς ἐχθρῷ* is 'heaven-detested' rather than 'unprincipled'. These words form an unappetizing study, but Demosthenes probably attached its distinctive meaning to each.

Among other points of vocabulary, the following may be noticed. In *Meid.* § 2 *καθεκτόν* is treated as = *ἀνεκτόν*. In *Meid.* § 20 *κληρονόμοι* can hardly be 'dispensers': it must be 'inheritors'—'the claim of the laws to satisfaction has passed to you'. In § 32 *καθάπαξ* is not 'total' (as opposed to 'partial'), but 'once and for all' (the opposite of 'temporarily'). In § 74 *σωφρόνως* implies self-control rather than prudence, and *ἀτιμαζομένους* is 'dishonoured' rather than 'provoked'. In § 99 the force of *τῇ ῥύμῃ*, 'impetuosity', hardly comes out. In § 109 *ἀναλαμβάνειν* is 'retract', rather than 'make amends'. In § 140 *συλλέγεσθε* is rendered 'band yourselves together' (as by Goodwin), but 'assemble in court' seems more likely. In § 149 *ὑποβαλομένη* is not 'adopted him' (a perfectly respectable proceeding), but 'passed him off as her own'. In § 196 *μεγάλην μένταν ἀρχήν*, *μᾶλλον δὲ τέχνην εἰς εὐρηκῶς* probably means 'you would have discovered a new source of power,—nay, a new art': *ἀρχήν* can hardly be 'method', and *τέχνην* is more than 'trick'. In § 203 *νεμίσθαι* is rendered 'spend' (as by Goodwin). May it not be 'divide it among yourselves'? The money divided as *θεωρικά* was not strictly the same money as the *εἰσφορά*, but it was public money, the sharing-out of which made the increased *εἰσφορά* necessary. In *Androt.* § 11 *σφόδρα* is not 'absolutely', but 'emphatically'. In § 59 *προαγῶνας* should be 'rehearsals', rather than merely 'an anticipation'. In § 75

τὴν ἴσῃ φιλοτιμίαν ἔχει 'implies the same regard for honour' seems less good than 'carries with it the same distinction' (a not infrequent sense of the word). In *Aristocr.* § 43 *οὐ καθαρῶς* is 'defiled', rather than 'unholy': in § 62 *συγχέειν* is perhaps 'confuse' rather than 'frustrate': in § 120 *προὔπηλάκισαν* hardly implies 'brutality'. In *Aristog.* I. § 74 *ἀνέκестον* is 'irremediable', not 'intolerable', and in § 34 *ἔθῃ* is not 'general character' (*ἥθη*) but 'common practice'.

(4) *Miscellaneous passages*. In *Meid.* § 131 Mr. Vince keeps *θανάτου ἀξίον* of the MSS (instead of Buttman's *ἑαυτοῦ ἀξίον* which most edd. receive) and renders it by 'worth risking his life for'. Is this possible, in view of the regular meaning of *θανάτου ἀξίος*? In § 139 *φθείρεσθαι πρὸς τοὺς πλουσίους* can hardly be 'abase themselves towards', but probably 'make their accused way to the side of'. In § 212 *καλῶς ποιοῦσι* should be not 'that is their good fortune', but 'small blame to them'. In *Androt.* § 70 *σαπρούς* is translated as if it were *σαπρά*. In *Aristocr.* § 55 *ἀγνοήσας* is not simply 'unwittingly', but 'through failure to recognize him', and in § 62 *πρόνοιαν ἔχειν* is not 'take precaution', but 'possess foresight'. In *Timocr.* § 106 'improvement' would be better for *βελτίους ποιεῖν* than 'reformation', as there is a reference to those yet unborn. In *Aristog.* I. § 2 *φύσεως* is not 'inmost conscience', but 'personal disposition' or 'character'. In *Timocr.* § 73 *τέλος ἔσχηκε* is translated as if the subject of *ἔσχηκε* were *δικαστήριον*.

(5) *Omissions in translation*. *Meid.* § 25 *καὶ τῆς μὲν . . . ἐπηρείας*: *Androt.* § 27 *τούτων οὐδὲν ἐστὶ ταυτό*: *Timocr.* § 59 *ἐτι* in last sentence.

There are a very few lapses into unnecessary colloquialism; e.g. *Meid.* § 4 'what he was up to', § 18 'put the cap on', *Androt.* § 10 'fairly leaped up on to the platform', § 26 'do the rest', § 71 'took up another job'. But these only serve to make the reader realize the generally unblameable English of the translation as a whole.

A. W. PICKARD-CAMBRIDGE.

University of Sheffield.

EXAMPLES FROM THE PAST.

DR. KARL JOST: *Das Beispiel und Vorbild der Vorfahren bei den attischen Rednern und Geschichtsschreibern bis Demosthenes*. Pp. xv+263. Paderborn: Schöningh, 1936. Paper, M. 9.

THIS is not a book whose subject will attract many; nor is it in any sense light reading. But it is ably written and suggestive in its arguments. Primarily it is an attempt to exhibit in as great detail as possible the part played by historical parallels in the oratory of the fifth and fourth centuries. But it seeks also to form some estimate of the 'historischen und psychologischen Ursachen der Verherrlichung der Vergangenheit,' and thereby to trace the gradual emergence among the Greeks of what Dr. Jost describes as 'das historische Bewusstsein,' 'the historical sense.' This last is a delicate task; and it may be questioned whether it is even possible to perform it successfully without overstepping the limits which the present volume prescribes for itself. How far, for instance, are we justified in seeking to explain why Demosthenes kept his gaze turned back upon the glories of the *haut empire*, without taking some account of the temper of the age in which he lived, of its spiritual, and therefore of its material, values, and of the brute force of circumstances in engendering those values? But this is perhaps unfair to Dr. Jost. He is concerned rather to discover what he can from the development of rhetorical technique in and by itself, to work from

the inside outwards by means of a careful analysis of the historical parallels used by orators or by historians in their set speeches. And this he does extremely well. He starts by an inquiry into the methods of proof familiar to ancient oratory, distinguishing between the terms *σημείον*, *τεκμήριον* and *παραδειγμα*, as used in the fifth and fourth centuries, with a very proper emphasis upon their fluid character. With the results thus obtained it is possible to introduce some kind of order into the mass of material to be examined. The orators and historians are taken in turn, and their methods exhibited with a wealth of illustration. Isocrates and Demosthenes, as might be expected, furnish the richest harvest: and it is in his chapters on these two that Dr. Jost has done some of his most valuable work. Antiphon furnishes little for comment, Andocides a good deal more — although Andocides will always remain something of an *enfant terrible* to those who have theories to prove on the subject of Greek oratory. There remain Lysias and the three historians, Herodotus, Thucydides, and Xenophon, considered in their oratorical aspect. Each is treated in detail, and the relation of each to his predecessors and successors exhibited as far as possible. The book is furnished with a useful bibliography; the footnotes are plentiful, but reasonably concise.

K. J. MAIDMENT.

Jesus College, Oxford.

ARISTOTLE'S LOGIC.

PAUL GOHLKE: *Die Entstehung der Aristotelischen Logik*. Pp. 128. Berlin: Junker und Dünhaupt, 1936. Paper, RM. 5.50.

DR. GOHLKE continues his work on the chronology of Aristotle's treatises, moving as before in a rather solitary orbit. If we accept all his claims, he shows us how Logic gradually secures its right to be a purely formal science, free from metaphysical dictation.

The *Categories* and *de Interpretatione* are A.'s first essays in Logic, contem-

porary with the older version of the *Topics*; they are not introductions to the existing *Organon*, for which they supply no true foundation, but the seeds from which it grew. The commentators, from Ammonius onwards, disguise this from us by importing into these earliest works the later terms and doctrines, especially (i) as regards the classification of judgments by quantity (universal — particular), which is not found in the *Topics* and *Categories*, and is only alluded to in *de Int.*; (ii) as regards opposition;

M

it was only at a later time that the vague term *ἀντικείμενον* was put aside, and replaced by two kinds of opposition, contrary and contradictory. Having shown this, Dr. Gohlke comes to the development of A.'s views on Modality, and on the nature of Demonstration, subjects which show the gradual escape from Metaphysics. The *Topics* and both *Analytics* are, in their present form, a mixture of recensions. The present *Post. An.* is later than *Pr. An.*, as its name indicates, but a very considerable section of it seems to reach right back to a time when even the figures of the syllogism were unknown,—and when nothing of *Pr. An.* can have existed. In the *Topics* the traces of change are chiefly seen in the contrast between the dialectical and the demonstrative modes of proof; A. had not always contrasted these in the manner given at the opening of the first book, whereby dialectic has 'probable opinions' for its premisses.

Dr. Gohlke evidently thinks that nothing is due to neglect, nothing to

human weakness, in these treatises; he approaches his author as a scientist might approach some part of Nature, confident that everything has a cause, and that there is order behind the apparent complexity. I see that on p. 79 A.'s failure to refer to a cognate passage is given as absolute proof that that passage is a later addition. On all this I confess to some well-worn doubts. Even the inference based on the quantitative division of judgments (see above) does not seem to me conclusive; the defects here are part of a wider failure of A.'s—his failure to give any separate treatment of the judgment and its forms. I lament also the fact that, in this book, both Jaeger and Solmsen receive the cold shoulder; which is an inconvenience to the reader, compelling him to make comparisons for himself. *Τὸ διαπορῆσαι καλῶς* is something which a student of the logical works should have learnt.

D. J. ALLAN.

Balliol College, Oxford.

THE YOUTH OF ORIGEN.

RENÉ CADIOU: *La jeunesse d'Origène.*

Histoire de l'École d'Alexandrie au début du III^e siècle. Pp. vi+424.

Paris: Beauchesne, 1935. Unbound, 38 fr.

ORIGEN and Plotinus both attended the school of Ammonius Saccas at Alexandria. On the basis of this fact M. Cadiou builds an imposing edifice of conjecture. 'Il y eut sans doute une époque où la philosophie platonicienne fut sensible à l'influence judéo-chrétienne. . . . Le néoplatonisme naquit en Syrie, et il grandit à Alexandrie' (pp. 205-6). Hardly 'sans doute'! The sole representative of the Syrian period is Numenius of Apamea, whose fragments evince an interest in the allegorical interpretation of mystery-cults of whatever provenance (see especially his own words *ap. Euseb. P.E.* IX 7, p. 411c), but—beyond a doubtful surmise of Origen—no knowledge whatever of Christianity. Ammonius wrote nothing,¹ and

the alleged fragments, though perhaps derived from his oral teaching and containing a nucleus of his doctrine, require the utmost care in interpretation; and it can hardly be said that M. Cadiou's construction is justified by the theory of their transmission which he adopts from von Arnim and F. Heinemann. Most damaging of all for M. Cadiou's hypothesis is the fact that Plotinus appears to make no use at all of Jewish or Christian writings (unless the latter are included in the general denunciation of gnosticism in *Enn.* II 9); that there are parallels in Origen and Plotinus is indisputable and natural, but these are traceable to purely Hellenic sources, usually to the current Platonism of the time. I am afraid too that the attempt to identify the two Origenes must be pronounced a failure; quite apart from the author's heroic effort to reconcile the chronology, there is the clear contrast

¹ The testimony of Longinus (*ap. Porph. Vit. Plot.* 20) is not absolutely conclusive, but taken in conjunction with (a) the pledge of silence to

which he bound his disciples (*ibid.* 3) and (b) the complete absence of well-authenticated fragments or even titles amounts practically to a certainty.

between the respect shown to 'Origen' by Porphyry, and by Longinus as quoted with obvious approval by Porphyry, in the *Vita Plotini* (14; 20), and the bitter censure by the same Porphyry quoted by Eusebius (*H. E.* VI 19. 7).

The biography of Origen and the detailed examination of the works of the pre-exile period are of a different order of value, though even here the author's weakness for hazardous generalization betrays itself: Rufinus is reinstated on

very dubious grounds (p. 266). These chapters, however, are clearly based on a minute first-hand knowledge of the texts, and are commended by a lucid and attractive style. Minor misprints are common, and bibliographical references regrettably careless (e.g. notes on pp. 69, 133, 177, 179, 189, 241).

B. S. PAGE.

*Armstrong College,
Newcastle-upon-Tyne.*

THE SEA IN LATIN POETRY.

E. DE SAINT-DENIS: *Le rôle de la mer dans la poésie latine*. Pp. 516. Paris: Klincksieck, 1935. Paper.

THE author gives a very full account of the sea and things marine or nautical as treated by all the Roman poets from Plautus and Ennius to Statius and Silius Italicus. Often all the terms used by a single poet are collected, and classified e.g. into *expressions banales* or *créations vigoureuses*. Similarly the descriptions of storms, of embarkations, of landings, and of nautical manoeuvres, and the imagery drawn from the sea, are collected as each poet is treated. Naturally this material, with the interesting conclusions drawn from it, means a big book; and this μέγα βιβλίον might have seemed a μέγα κακόν, were it not for the excellent analytical table of contents (14 pages long) which enables the reader to pick and choose what to read.

Constant touch is kept with history. In their proper places are treated the emergence of Rome as a naval power, the development of Baiae and similar places as centres of fashion, and the naval policy of Augustus.

The author does not fail to enquire how each poet observed the sea. Thus, Ennius is *premier peintre de la mer*, though his non-technical language shows that he only saw and knew it as a spectator; Plautus has lived among sailors and fishermen; Virgil is superior to Ovid and more varied and original in depicting the sea itself, but as a poet

of navigation Ovid eclipses Virgil in precision and vividness; Horace and Tibullus are landmen; in Seneca and Lucan (as previously in Ovid) the author establishes a more intimate and technical observation; but Valerius Flaccus, Statius, and Silius are shown to fall back on stale imitation of Homer, Apollonius, or Virgil. Some approach to a romantic treatment of the sea is found in parts of Lucan (pp. 436-7); but I wish the author had explained that difficult word *romantisme*. Two of the examples are the sea as a setting appropriate to the dignity of Caesar (V. 653-4) and the picture of the *saeva quies pelagi* with such personifying words as *maestus* and *oblitus* (V. 442 ff.).

The final question is that of the Romans' love of the sea; their poetry of the sea contained much that was borrowed but also much that was original, as the author abundantly shows. Had they then the sea in their blood? The answer is no. Their love was an acquired one. After Actium there appear an interest in nautical technique and a sense of ownership over the sea; but the love of the sea for the Romans was especially the relish they had for the marine landscape and for residence on a beautiful coast. Hence the Roman poets excel in the sea-scenes which can be watched from the shore.

ARNOLD M. DUFF.

*University College of Wales,
Aberystwyth.*

MAGNITUDO ANIMI.

ULRICH KNOCHE: *Magnitudo animi*; Untersuchungen zur Entstehung und Entwicklung eines römischen Wertgedankens. Pp. 93. (*Philologus*, Supplementband XXVII, Heft 3.) Leipzig: Dieterich, 1935. Paper, M. 5.50 (bound, 6.80).

THIS is an interesting if unexpected study in Roman ethical terminology. After tracing its earlier history, Herr Knoche seeks to prove that the term *magnitudo animi* came into general use about the seventh decade B.C., not casually, but as the deliberate expression of two conflicting political ideals. On the one hand it was characteristic of the old Roman Stoic school typified by Cato, which regarded it as the special preserve of the *nobiles* or ruling caste; on the other it was recognized as the aim of the energetic young moderns, Caesar, Crassus, and even Catiline, who were largely influenced by the Peripatetic conception of *μεγαλοψυχία* as an *ἀρετή παντελής*. In fact, *magnitudo animi* was a political shibboleth of the highest importance, claimed both by *optimates* and by *populares*, and Sallust's contrasting portraits of Caesar and Cato in the *Catiline* well illustrate the antithesis between the two schools of thought. In its Peripatetic aspect, *magnitudo animi* was a natural and essential quality of a leader (*eine Qualität, die das Wesen des Führers ausmacht*), and this becomes more apparent as the character of Caesar develops. At the height of his career, Caesar represents a fusion of both ideals, the Stoic and the Peripatetic, combining the *fortitudo* and the *patientia* of the former with the *clementia* of the latter; and as such he is portrayed by a repentant and under-

standing Cicero in the *Pro Marcello*. Finally this fusion reappears even more markedly in Augustus: 'so wird Augustus der eigentliche Begründer des Idealbildes vom grossmütigen Herrscher'.

Such in bare outline is Herr Knoche's thesis. It is carefully and ingeniously worked out, with a detailed examination of Ciceronian and Sallustian terminology as compared with that of Aristotle. Naturally the reactions of his readers will depend upon their view of Caesar: Mommsen would have found it good. There may be truth in the main conclusion; but if *magnitudo animi* bears a very definite political sense, can we really say the same of *magnus*? The author makes similar claims for it also (he remarks that it was no accident, and not without mockery, that Catullus writes of *magnus Caesar*). Yet he does not examine the character of Pompey the Great, which one would have thought an essential corollary to his thesis. The whole thing has an indefinable air of unsubstantiality.

Herr Knoche's work is well documented, shows method, clarity and comprehension, and is full of interesting suggestions (compare his mention of Catiline as a candidate for *magnitudo animi* with Cicero's characterization of him in the *Pro Caelio*). He himself describes it as *die Biographie einer Idee*; not unjustly, as its qualities show; and like most good biographies it has a shade of bias which is not discreditable to its author. But a more significant description might have been 'die Formung eines Führers'.

R. G. AUSTIN.

University of Glasgow.

A NEW TEXT OF TACITUS' HISTORIES.

P. *Cornelii Taciti libri qui supersunt*; rec. C. HALM. Post G. ANDRESEN denuo curavit E. KOESTERMANN. Tom. II, fasc. I, *Historiarum libri*. Leipzig: Teubner, 1935. Cloth, (export price) RM. 1.80.

SUCCESSIVE editors of the *Histories* in this series reject many readings begotten or adopted by the preceding editor, and

import something new or restore something old in their place. There is nothing to complain of in that; but we may wonder how many of Koestermann's new readings will stand his successor's scrutiny. His text is an advance, but is certainly not final. Probably Swedish scholars will reject some things that he thinks acceptable

and a good many of his suggestions printed in the *apparatus* will be con-signed to oblivion.

There seem to be sixteen of his conjectures in the text. Of these three look certain—*illico* for *illic*, III. 17; *studio* <quo> . . . *perrumperet*, IV. 12; *arma* <tae>, IV. 25. Four are pretty certain to go under—*Corinthis*, <in> *Achaiae urbe*, II. 1, where *Achaiae* (= *Achaica*) defends the plain ablative (cf. III. 22 *eadem utraque acie arma*, where he suggests <in> *u. in n. cr.*); *foveat* for *fovet* after *dum*, III. 38; *vol-gus* . . . *avebat* for *volgus* . . . *haberet*, III. 55, where he refers to the *Thesaurus s.v. aveo*, though anyone who looks there will see the extreme improbability of *aveo* being used without accusative or infinitive expressed or implied; <trans> *fugeret*, IV. 18, where K. notes 'ut v. 20' (*transfugiens*), which seems to supply a strong reason for not tampering with *fugeret* (see Sörbom, *Variatio sermonis Tacitei*, p. 42). The remaining

nine look possible, but uncertain. The weakest is *signa seu* for *signas* at I. 31, in spite of *trierarchis* (= *trierarchi seu*) before *nutantes* at II. 9; for the preceding *magis* seems to demand *quam* (Heinsius).

There is no need to refer in detail to his numerous conjectures included in the notes. A good many are attractive. The worst is probably *Italiam* . . . *ipso transitu exercitus exhaustam* for *vastam* at II. 32, where it is hard indeed to see the need of an alteration. *Vastitas Italiae*!

The misprints are rather tiresome, but fortunately (except *mode*, p. 3) they do not occur in the text. The lines are wrongly numbered on pp. 51, 154, 162; 2 should be 5 (p. 138, *n. cr.*), *postis* is for *hostis* (183), *Antonio* for *Annio* (214), and something is wrong with the reference to *Agr. 23* (107).

E. C. MARCHANT.

Lincoln College, Oxford.

POSTCLASSICA VARIA.

- (1) W. J. ENTWISTLE: *The Spanish Language, together with Portuguese, Catalan, and Basque*. Pp. viii+367. London: Faber and Faber, 1936. Cloth, 12s. 6d.
- (2) *Bibliotheca Scriptorum Medii Recentisque Aevorum*, ten instalments (see p. 163).
- (3) C. S. LEWIS: *The Allegory of Love, A Study in Medieval Tradition*. Pp. ix+378. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1936. Cloth, 15s.
- (4) H. D. WATSON: *The Hunting of the Snark*, by Lewis Carroll. Translated into Latin Elegiacs. With Translator's Note Appended on the Inner Meaning of the Poem and Other Things. With a Foreword by Professor Gilbert Murray. Pp. xvi+115. Oxford: Blackwell, 1936. Cloth, 5s.
- (1) THE C.R. can devote but little space to this fascinating and masterly book, for the greater part of it is outside our sphere. It contains not merely an historical survey of Spanish, but of Catalan, Portuguese (including Gallego), and even a short but satisfactory survey of Basque—the best, perhaps, for the

English reader who has never had time to investigate that astonishing linguistic survival, as interesting to the philologist as a fossil to the zoologist. Professor Entwistle makes clear the essential passivity of the Basque verb,¹ the necessity of getting rid of the ideas of subject and object in favour of agent, patient and recipient, and allows himself no rash theories as to the cognation of Basque with other languages, though North African (Berber, Nubian, Cushite) seems the least improbable suggestion.

His third chapter, *The Latin of Spain*, is the only one entirely relevant to our studies, and it is admirably planned and carried out, treating in turn of the testimony of inscriptions and classical authors (here a word more might have been said of the Spanish place-names in Martial), the relation of Spanish Latin to that of the rest of 'Romania', and the characteristics of Ibero-Romance. The evidence both of inscriptions and

¹ Since this was written, Professor Entwistle has admirably developed his theme in *Medium Aevum* (June, 1936), Vol. V, pp. 105-114.

Spanish-Latin writers, and of later development in Iberian languages points to a few divergences from late Latin elsewhere, in such words as *paramus*, *tam-magnus*, *socra*, *lausia* (flagstone), *natus* (=child), *natales* (=ancestry), *superum* (adverb tending towards preposition), *altarium* (back-formation from *altaria*, Spanish *otero*, hillock), *ante-natus* (stepchild), *argenteus* (=white), *symphonia* (a musical instrument, Spanish *zampoña*), *malleolus* (new vine or white hawthorn), *merendare* (to lunch).

Professor Entwistle rightly insists on the archaism of Portuguese—so strangely neglected by classical scholars in this country—which makes it the most Latin of all Romance languages. He tells us, with Camões, how when lovely Venus, moved to protect the Portuguese people for their pristine Roman virtues, thought of the language—

com pouca corrupção crê que é a latina,
and he might have illustrated this by lines which are both good Latin and good Portuguese, written by Duarte Nunes de Leão at the end of the sixteenth century. Thus does he introduce them:

De quem, senhor, honrastes tantas vezes,
Aceitai estes versos peregrinos,
Que, lidos em latim, serão latinos,
Lidos em português, são portugueses.

This is the little bilingual poem, in honour of St. Ursula:

Canto tuas palmas, famosos canto triumphos,
Ursula divinos martyr concede favores:
Subjectas sacra nympha feros animosa tyrannos;
Tu phoenix vivendo ardes, ardendo triumphas.
Illustres generosa choras das Ursula, bellas
Das rosa bella rosas, fortes das sancta columnas.
Aeternos vivas annos, o regia planta,
Devotos cantando hymnos, vos invoco sanctas,
Tam puras nymphas amo, adoro, canto, celebros:
Per vos felices annos, o candida turba,
Per vos innumeros de Christo spero favores.

A word of caution may be allowed in respect of some of Professor Entwistle's etymologies. Portuguese *até* may be derived from Arabic *hatta*, but it is only fair to mention the theory that some compound of Latin *tenus* (*hac-tenus*, *ad-tenus*) may be concerned: and if Basque *atxeter* (physician) is derived

from *archiater*, and though *tio*, *para*, *cada* are pure Greek, the suggestion that old-Spanish *maguer* ('despite the fact that') 'probably renders the Greek μακάριε—"But, my dear Sir"', seems a little more than rash, in the face of the existence of *malgré*, *maugré* in French. I should not however like to conclude this notice on a note of criticism: 'The Spanish Language' is a book to read through from beginning to end, and then to keep permanently for reference.

(2) The earlier issues of this *Bibliotheca* were noticed in C.R. XLVIII, 30. Of those now to hand, the publication of the most general interest is the *Quatuor Libri Amorum* of Conrad Celtes—less for the details of his affairs with Hasilina, Elsula, Ursula and Barbara (who generally seemed to betray him for the embraces of a local parson) than for the topographical information afforded by the accounts of his wanderings in central and northern Europe. Next in importance perhaps are the *Elegies*, addressed to Lorenzo de' Medici, of the Florentine Naldus de Naldis (1439-c. 1518), from which we may glean a little of contemporary Italian personalities, and the *Compendium* on the life of Cosmo de' Medici by Amerigo Corsini (1442-1501). The fragmentary *Borsias* of Tito Vespasiano Strozza (1425-1505) is also essentially of Italian interest, being an account of the origins of the Este family: his *Bucolicon liber* is undistinguished.

Central Europe is touched by two works dealing with Matthias Corvinus: a poetical account of his battles and military victories by the Roman Alesandro Cortese (1464-1491), and an anecdotal biography by Galeotto Marzio of Narnia (1427-c. 1497), in which there are some good stories of the monarch's wise doings and sayings. The others include an *epithalamium* on the wedding of King Ladislas and Anne de Foix (29 September 1502) by Matthaeus Andronicus of Traù, dedicated to the Hungarian Bishop Nicholas of Csák: the poetical works of Nicolas Oláh (1493-1568) of Sibiu, who knew some Greek and liked the epode metres of Horace: a panegyric on Leopold III,

marquess of Austria, delivered at the University of Vienna in 1512 by Thomas Stretzinger of Korneuburg, who unfortunately hanged himself in 1523: and the miscellaneous poems of Nicolas Istánffy (1538-1613)—uninspired, but of some historical interest with regard to Hungary and Transylvania.

(3) Mr. Lewis's *Allegory of Love* can have but a short notice here, though it is a book well worth study by the general reader. As a guide to it—for it is not all easy reading—I would recommend Mr. G. M. Young's careful and lucid review in the *Sunday Times* of June 28th. In his opening chapters Mr. Lewis 'tries to explain and to characterize the allegorical legacy which the ancient world on its death-bed bequeathed to the Dark Ages', and there are useful analyses of several works of this kind by writers of early medieval Latin. The classical scholar will find interesting studies of allegory in Statius, Prudentius, Claudian, Sidonius Apollinaris, Martianus Capella, Bernardus Sylvestris, Alanus de Insulis and Johannes de Altavilla: and I hope he will not put the book down when he reaches the less familiar fields of the *Romance of the Rose*, whence he is led to Chaucer, Gower, and Spenser.

(4) I noticed in C.R. XLIX, p. 25, a translation of *The Hunting of the Snark*

into Latin hexameters by Mr. P. R. Brinton. Here is one in elegiacs, which I slightly prefer. Mr. Watson gives up the unequal task of trying to render 'Fry me, or fritter my wig', but he is often successful, as may be seen from the two following examples:

They sought it with thimbles, they sought it
with care;
They pursued it with forks and hope;
They threatened its life with a railway-share;
They charmed it with smiles and soap.

Cum cura et digiti quaerunt muliebribus armis,
Cum furcis etiam spe comitante petunt,
Instrumenta viae ferratae scripta minantur,
Sapone et fabricant risibus illecebras.

and, climax and finale:

In the midst of the word he was trying to say,
In the midst of his laughter and glee,
He had softly and suddenly vanished away—
For the Snark was a Boojum, you see.

Scilicet in medio, quod nititur edere, verbo,
In mediis risus laetitiaeque sonis,
Tranquille in tenebris subitoque evanuit auras,
Snark quoniam, lector, denique Buius erat.

Mr. Watson is, I think, less happy in his rendering of poems on the League of Nations, though to these he doubtless owes the Foreword by Professor Gilbert Murray. I prefer his poems, in English and Latin, on various dogs and cats that have brightened his home.

STEPHEN GASELEE.

THE GREEK LANGUAGE.

A. F. SEMENOV: *The Greek Language in its Evolution*. Pp. 208. London: Allen and Unwin, 1936. Cloth, 7s. 6d.

THE author announces his book as an introduction to the scientific study of the Greek language, and it takes the form of an outline account of the evolution of the language from Homer down to the present day, followed by an historical survey of Greek syntax. The philologist would welcome this attempt to fill a gap in our literature but for the fact that stilted, and sometimes faulty, English, unorthodox punctuation, careless proof-reading, confused exposition, and much inaccuracy of detail detract

considerably from the value of the book. We select some isolated points which invite criticism. On p. 16 it is suggested that the genitive *φρέατος* has replaced *φρέαρος*, which of course never existed. It is misleading to use 'Vulgar Greek' as a synonym for 'Greek spoken in the Middle Ages' (p. 17). Chapter I begins with a curious attempt to distinguish 'genuine Greek words' from words in related languages by an appeal to sound-correspondences. This, we fear, will merely confuse the student: it is the individual languages which are given and the sound-correspondences which are deduced. The examples of the sound-correspondences themselves

are not happily chosen. Forms like *σπρωτός* etc. rest on complicated Ablaut-relationships which are still disputed (Schwyzer, *Gr. Gr.* p. 361). The problem of the Greek representation of the I.-E. *j* is still unsolved, so that the author's statement (p. 26) 'if this sound was preceded by a media aspirata, the sound appears as ζ' is misleading, nor is it supported by the examples which are adduced. Errors of typography and transcription abound in this part of the book. On p. 25 *pa*, *çīrša*, *stīrnas*, **molduis*, pl, *ī*, *λα*, *υῖη*, *īm*, *δματός*, *ñ*, *γνατός* should be corrected to *pā*, *çīršan-*, *stīrñas*, **moldūis*, pl, *ī*, *λā*, *υῖη*, *īm*, *δματός*, *ñ*, *γνατός*. On p. 26 *jaj*, *judh*, *jah*, *jusmā*, *jusā*, *jugā*, *Djauh*, *súdas* should appear as *yaj*, *yudh*, *yah*, *yusmán*, *yūsa*, *yugā*-, *Dyāuh*, *sádas*-. The author is further inconsistent in his quotation of Sanskrit forms; sometimes the stem is given without indication that it is a stem (e.g. *jugā* for *yugā*-), and where the nominative case is quoted there is inconsistency in the treatment of final -s, which appears sometimes unchanged and sometimes as visarga (e.g. *Djauh* but *stīrnās*).

The Latin Juppiter is not 'from Juh-pitar = *Zeús πατήρ*' but from **dieu pater* = *Zeús πάτερ*. It is not true to say that 'the sibilant s . . . between two vowels appears in Greek as the spiritus asper.' It does not 'appear' under these conditions, except of course secondary intervocalic -s- in Laconian etc. The same inaccuracy occurs on p. 31, where we read 'the mediae aspiratae appear as tenues aspiratae in Italic.' Contrary to the statement on p. 27, not all gutturals of the primitive language followed by *j* or *y* (what

sounds are these symbols meant to represent?) become *σσ* or *ττ*. The law should read 'Voiceless gutturals. . .'. Moreover the quotation 'Sanskrit ca- (why the stem sign?), in Greek *τε* (from *ττ*)', in this connection is a gross error, the Greek dental here representing an original labio-velar (cf. Latin -*que*). Where do 'the sounds *dh* + *j* appear in Greek as *τς*'? How can **totjās* (Greek *τόσσος*) become in Latin *tōtus*? The genitive *totius* proves nothing, and what of the quantity? The statement that in both Latin and Greek 'in the first and second declensions we find . . . the ending of the dative instead of the original ending of the locative and in the third declension we find, on the contrary, the locative instead of the dative (cf. *λύκῳ* lupo, *πόλῃ* siti)' is preposterous. The classical *Romae*, of course, covers forms of entirely different origin, the locative *Romā-i* and the dative **Romā-ei*, *Romāi*; and how can *sit-i* be equated with *πολῃ-i*? There are other egregious errors in the account of the ancient dialects. The author seems unaware that one of the chief characteristics of the Aeolic group of dialects is their representation of the labio-velars as labials before both front and back vowels and consonants. This law appears in the distorted form (p. 58) 'In the syllables *τε* and *τεi* in the beginning of words and after a nasal the *τ* becomes *π*.' With this exigencies of space compel us regretfully to lay the book down. It is perhaps superfluous to say that it is not to be recommended as an introduction to the scientific study of the Greek language.

L. R. PALMER.

University of Manchester.

MODE IN ANCIENT GREEK MUSIC.

R. P. WINNINGTON-INGRAM: *Mode in Ancient Greek Music*. Pp. viii+90. (Cambridge Classical Studies, II.) Cambridge: University Press, 1936. Cloth, 7s. 6d.

APOLOGIES are due to the author of this very technical monograph that the task of reviewing it here has descended

to one of small competence. Perhaps I can most usefully fill the space allowed by describing the scope of the book and the tentative conclusions reached.

If we knew the notes of Plato's modes, and their organization (e.g. what their 'tonic' was), we could hope to begin to understand what Plato said

about their ethos. The evidence is (1) direct, (2) the seven species,¹ (3) ancient scales given by Plutarch and A. Q., (4) the music fragments, (5) the treatment of mode, and ethos, by the theorists. Of these, (1) is slight. Arist. *Probl.* XIX 20, the most promising text, speaks (apparently) of Mese as 'tonic'; but Mese *κατὰ δύναμιν* (a fixed note, *a*) or *κατὰ θέσιν* (fourth from the bottom of any given scale)? Not the latter, for it would involve us in difficulties with the non-diatonic genera of some modes. If the former, is the statement true? Monro's view is rejected, and Macran's—a serious blow this, for Macran made sense of Plato; yet it seems true that nothing supports it but this passage, certainly not the fragments. Either then the statement was made of Dorian only (of which it would be true), or it was true generally, but for a limited period, that which saw a systematization of theory by A., and possibly of practice too. (See below.)

(2) The modal names, sometimes even the title *ἁρμονία*, were attached to the species. Were the old modes simply these? Cogent arguments are given against this; still more cogent against Riemann's triadic grouping based on this identification. Yet the inheritance of the modal names indicates some connection between modes and species; 'it seems probable that the species are systematized surrogates of less uniform scales and display a greater symmetry than did their fore-runners' (p. 10)—a view *a priori* reasonable, and supported by (3). Here we have irregular, gapped scales, the majority of which (as given, but no great reliance is placed on this evidence) are not even of an octave in compass. These look like genuine local

modes uncontaminated; the species like a 'rationalization' of them; and it is perhaps significant that A., who gives the species, appears to think little of modal ethos. From A. Q., who preserves these scales, an interesting passage is cited later (p. 55), that what matters, for ethos, is less the scale than the use made of it, the emphasizing of some notes and omission of others—gapping, in fact. A. Q. was interested in ethos, and knew 'the school of Damon'; this again suggests that the old modes were not plain octaves, at least in practice.

Evidence (4) is disappointing; the earlier the more fragmentary. It does not suggest that Mese *κατὰ δύναμιν* was a general tonic. Apparently thetic Mese sometimes was, but the evidence is very incomplete. In general, (2), (3), and (4) fail either to support or to refute each other.

(5) involves a condensed but admirably clear exposition of the relation between mode and *τόνος* (key). Pitch-keys, like ours, arose; the Aristoxenians had fifteen of them, and a theory that relegated ethos to the sphere of *μελοποιία*; but the *τόνοι* of Ptolemy (second century A.D.) were the seven modal species, which are expressive of ethos. What had been the thirteen *τόνοι* of A. himself? This is not clear; possibly was not even to A. It can be argued that they were modal; on the other hand, the precision and uniformity of his theory seem fatal to the idiosyncrasy of mode. If then A.'s theory, designed as a practical one, was really non-modal, while Ptolemy, much later, equally practical, was definitely modal, what are we to say? It is 'possible to account for what may be thought to be the facts' only by assuming (a) an early period of native and sharply-characterized modes; then (b) a measure of standardization, involving the loss of 'ethical' differences; but this a movement mainly of professors and virtuosi; (c) a return, in a simpler form, to modalities which had always continued in popular use. The picture is not an unlikely one, 'but the facts themselves are only hypothetical'.—'A result to give rise to pessimism, and the prospects of further advance are not bright.'

¹ The seven species of the octave are the familiar seven forms of the octave which can be extracted from the white keys of the piano; they vary in the positions of the semitones; difference of pitch is immaterial. 'Gapped scales', referred to later, may be roughly illustrated by the 'pentatonic' scale (compass an octave, but containing only five notes) which gives so marked an ethos to many Gaelic melodies. A. is Aristoxenus; A. Q. Aristides Quintilianus.

A clear, sensible and delicate handling of a difficult subject. If at the end Mr. Winnington-Ingram affirms much less than others, he is at least found

standing firmly on both his feet—in this field distinction enough.

H. D. F. KITTO.

University of Glasgow.

ILLUSTRATIONS OF GREEK SCULPTURE.

D. C. WILKINSON: *Greek Sculpture*. Pp. xvi; 104 half-tone plates. London: Chatto and Windus, 1936. Cloth, 5s.

THE latest cheap set of illustrations of Greek sculpture has been selected on the sound anthologist's rule of choosing the best and most characteristic pieces of each age and school irrespective of modern taste. It is not an easy rule to follow, especially because so many of the statues which set a standard for their time are only known from copies aesthetically worthless and of uncertain fidelity; some copies obviously had to be included to show the trend of artists' ideals, but to show a single miniature copy of a very detailed colossus may mislead as much as instruct. Apart from this question of copies, the selection of statues is excellent. Reliefs are poorly represented except for the fifth century; it would have been fairer to restrict the book to statues than to give only one example of archaic relief, two scraps of Mausoleum friezes for the fourth century, one stretch of Gigantomachy and a Neo-Attic slab for the Hellenistic age.

The text is concise and should be a useful guide to those unfamiliar with the subject. In the expectation of future editions, it may be worth while pointing out passages that could be improved.

Page viii: Carving limestone with a knife sounds to me amateurish, and can anyone distinguish between marks left by a knife and by a wide chisel? Archaic sculpture is *almost*, not entirely, confined to three main types. Archaic Greek statues are freer and fresher than contemporary Egyptian. Was communication in Greece really more difficult in the sixth century than later?

P. ix: The belief that there are two distinct types of *korai* at Athens depends on faith as well as observation.

P. x: The Berlin goddess is now known to come from Taranto, not Locri.

P. xi: Misprint, *vigueur*.

P. xvii: Perhaps not all fifth-century torsos look stylized and lifeless beside the Hermes of Olympia. In the Munich copy, the Aphrodite of Cnidus is apparently putting on her drapery.

P. xviii: Lysippus must have cared for the expression of emotions in his Alexanders.

P. xix: The ship on which the Victory of Samothrace stood is of Rhodian marble; so is the inscription, which is the signature of a Rhodian sculptor of about 180 but need not belong to the statue.

P. xx: There cannot be much connexion between the early Rhodian school and that of 30 B.C., and it would clarify matters to mention the Laocoon after the Pergamene school on which it is based. The date of Attalus' smaller statues should be queried. The physiological inventions were by no means fresh to the minor arts, nor altogether unknown in previous large sculpture. The last sentence might be clearer.

P. xxi: Transparent drapery was an innovation 150 years before the Telephus frieze. The second sentence about Damophon has no point without an illustration. There is nothing to connect the Aphrodite of Melos with Delos and there may have been good reason for its being half-draped. The Aphrodite from Cyrene might be several generations later.

P. xxii: The Berber's head may not be third-century. The seams in the face of Euthydemus are said to be largely modern work.

Apart from these points the text should serve its purpose.

A. W. LAWRENCE.

Cambridge.

ARCHAIC GREEK SCULPTURE.

Manuel d'Archéologie Grecque. La Sculpture. I. Période archaïque, par CHARLES PICARD. Pp. 704; 14 plates, 237 figures. Paris: Picard, 1935. Paper, 95 fr. (bound, 107 or 125).

THE present is the first of three volumes on Greek sculpture, similar in form and plan to Contenau's *Manuel d'Archéologie Orientale*. The enterprise is comparable only to the history of ancient art by Perrot and Chipiez, and its importance to scholarship will be greater. Unfortunately the publisher has fallen far below the standard of his predecessors in all technical matters. The design of the type and page is so abominable that it makes consecutive reading not merely dreary but almost impossible. The illustrations are well chosen and some are unusual, but apart from three coloured reproductions (apparently from watercolour drawings) the plates lack detail, the half-tones in the text are bad in quality and often too small in scale for such poor blocks, while some of the line drawings give a muddled impression of objects that are themselves clear-cut. The price is low but the effort to reduce cost has ruined the book. It is very much to be hoped that future volumes will have better pictures, even if they must have fewer. And they should have a more rational index (one entry reads *Polynésie grecque*; cf. *Archipel ééen*).

The *Manuel* is far more than a history of Greek sculpture; it is an attempt to show the place of sculpture in Greek life and to tell all that is known about the art. The range of the author's knowledge is tremendous and he crowds all he can into both text and notes; Perrot and Chipiez were never learned like this. As one who has merely gone through the pages once, reading as much at a time as the soporific typography would allow, I cannot hope to criticize the matter in detail—only long use of the book could qualify me to do so. The errors and undesirable omissions that I did notice are few and unimportant. The list of museums and their publications might with advantage have mentioned the Graeco-Egyptian collection of the Pelizaeus Museum at

Hildesheim, with Roeder's guide-book, and there is no reference to Rhys Carpenter's *The Greeks in Spain*; the bronzes found on the acropolis at Athens are in the National Museum, not in the Acropolis Museum. The list of museums of casts (compiled of course before the removal of the British Museum's collection) should include that of Cambridge University and the one which used to be at Birmingham and is now, I think, at Perth. There is practically no evidence that the Vaphio cups reproduce a stucco relief at Cnossus (p. 98) nor is there much probability that a local sculptor carved the reliefs outside the Treasury of Atreus (p. 112). I have not seen any reference to Forsdyke's *Minoan Art*. Richer's theory that the archaic smile was borrowed by the Greeks from Egypt (p. 264) should be met by Hall's more probable suggestion that Egypt borrowed it from the Greeks. It is not certain that the ivories from Samaria formed part of Ahab's Ivory House (p. 303). A good instance of polychrome relief (p. 315) could be quoted in a tomb at Myra, published by Fellows (*Account of Discoveries in Lycia*, pl. at p. 198). An argument is misrepresented in note 3, p. 555; the Cypriote statuette (not statue) in New York, no. 1262, was merely identified as an imitation of something like Antenor's Kore.

To turn to more dubious points, the metopes of Temple C at Selinus (p. 522) cannot be earlier than 550 according to Ashmole, who is most likely to know; and we would not all recognize the 'brotherly likeness' between the New York kouros and the Berlin standing goddess (p. 592).

The discussion of each subject is adequately full. The author shows the weakness of past fashions in stylistic criticism but he allots perhaps too much space to that now prevalent; the determination of sculptors' technique has not, I think, progressed so far as to supply very useful criteria to the archaeologist. It seems as though M. Picard has not worked on this subject himself, and the source of most of his remarks is acknowledged to be St. Casson (Vatican and Oxford

papers please copy). The writer of a book intended largely for foreign readers should restrain his vocabulary; a working knowledge of French seldom stretches from *peu ou prou* to *tout de go*, and diverse learning is needed to appreciate the metaphoric *par endosmose* or the antithesis between *ankylosée* and *passer outre*. The style has not the clarity traditional in French writing, and the point of some sentences would

be hard enough to follow without the rare words and phrases and the scraps of gallicized Greek. The remaining volumes will be the more appreciated if their author makes them simpler; it is no small thing to say that anyone interested in almost any aspect of ancient Greece would be repaid for the trouble of reading the first.

A. W. LAWRENCE.

Cambridge.

GREEK SCULPTURE IN ITALY AND SICILY.

BERNARD ASHMOLE: *Late Archaic and Early Classical Greek Sculpture in Sicily and South Italy*. Pp. 34; 84 half-tone illustrations. (From the Proceedings of the British Academy, Vol. XX.) London: Milford, 1936. Paper, 7s. 6d.

THIS, the most scholarly piece of work on ancient sculpture ever written in English—and it is beautifully written—gives as clear a picture as is now possible of how the art of Sicily and South Italy differed from that of Greece proper; if it does not go far towards distinguishing local schools within this area that is only because of the scrappiness of the material. It does however make it plain that the local variations are of no more consequence than those which can be traced in the Aegean, which is a point worth making; a general likeness between the products of the various states of Magna Graecia has long been suspected but was not previously demonstrated. It has now been analysed, and found to lie in a primitive spirit which persisted after Greece itself had discarded archaism, and in a pictorial flavour in arts which in Greece were dominated by sculptural habits of design. The absence of local marble to carve is not a sufficient explanation, for the stylistic discrepancy between marble and bronze work soon became insignificant in Greece; and if bronze were too expensive there was plenty of clay which could be turned into statues of terracotta. Take too the example of Cyprus, equally void of marble (though full of metal which was rarely used by artists), which maintained for centuries an enormous output of sculpture in its

own poor stone and in terracotta. If Magna Graecia had wished, it might have done the same. It looks as though Magna Graecia felt some compulsion towards pictorial expression—another instance of the persistent Italian inclination for painting. If so, the slight tendency of the colonists to merge with the Latin population can scarcely account for the phenomenon on racial grounds. Nor does the scenery differ so markedly from the Greek as to induce such a contrast, while it certainly differs greatly from the matronly spreading contours of Tuscany and Umbria, the home of Renaissance painting. Yet, on consideration, is not the landscape more like the Corinthian than any to be seen from the marble-centres of Greece, and did not Corinth turn out the least sculptural of Greek paintings?

All the available material has been used to the utmost in this little book—statues and statuettes of marble and bronze, terracotta figurines and plaques, coins, gems, and historical facts; still, to round off the essay, a page or two might have been added on the peculiarities of Western Greek architecture and architectural ornament. Otherwise not a word is lacking or wasted, and the pages are brimming with suggestive asides. Most of the objects under discussion are of no great intrinsic interest; but a couple of sentences clear up the disputed relationship of the Ludovisi and Boston thrones; the Ludovisi is carved with masterly freedom, therefore by someone trained in Greece, probably in the Cyclades, but possibly Italian-born, while the

counterpart shows a lack of marble-sense which betrays the stay-at-home Westerner. The acuteness of observa-

tion is characteristic, and is constant throughout this little masterpiece.

Cambridge. A. W. LAWRENCE.

HELLENISTIC ARCHITECTURE.

THEODORE FYFE: *Hellenistic Architecture*, An Introductory Study. Pp. xiv + 206; 58 line-blocks and 30 half-tone plates. Cambridge: University Press, 1936. Cloth, 21s.

WHAT is Hellenistic architecture? Did it start with Alexander and come to a neat end with Rome's appearance in the East, to be replaced from that moment by something which can be labelled Roman? Mr. Fyfe claims not only that there is no perceptible line of cleavage between the fourth century and the Hellenistic Age, which means that the Mausoleum and the temple at Tegea are Hellenistic, but that, save for Rome itself and Europe north and west of it, the architecture of the first century B.C. and the first four centuries A.D. is Roman only in period, and owes little to Roman agency except the wealth and security necessary for its production. Thus the 'Hellenistic' architect is not represented solely by such sites as Priene and Pergamon and other remains of the late fourth, the third and the second centuries B.C., but by the vast temples of Baalbek and Palmyra also, four centuries or so later, where, though there are oriental touches, the orderliness and clarity are, like most of the detail, still recognizably Greek, and the dominating member is still the beam, not the arch.

After a preliminary survey of the various centres of Hellenistic architecture known to us, temples, tombs and other monuments, houses, and town-plans are discussed. Among these chapters are inserted others on the Orders, on detail and decoration, and on materials, construction and technique; all of interest, especially to the architectural student.

The ideal of the classical temple-interior is well stated (let us pray that the architect of the new Elgin Room recognizes it!) 'to give a satisfying sense of scale and avoid the undue domination of the visible Presence by

architectural accessories'. Hellenistic temples, Mr. Fyfe feels, had not perhaps this quality: sculpture became an architectural accessory, the development of architectural treatment was the absorbing passion, and architectural form was manipulated into set composition-pieces. Not until many centuries later is there a parallel, and it is a striking one, to the classical cult-images—the great mosaic Christs who dominate such buildings as the cathedral at Monreale; and in the meantime there had been evolved in Syria something that was to outlive them—architectural set-pieces of subtle intention foreshadowing the altar-setting of the Christian church.

The section on tombs includes the rock-cut monuments of Petra, the grave-towers at Palmyra (hardly the first detached monumental towers, for archaic Lycian tombs have the same motive and differ only in size); the underground tombs of Egypt; and Pharos. There is a satisfactory study of the houses of Delos and Herculaneum, and of the Palmyrene houses of the second century A.D. with Corinthian peristyle courts, which perpetuate earlier Hellenistic ideas but embody certain Mesopotamian and oriental features. In the section on town-planning the freshest material is that from Gerash and Baalbek; and from Corinth, where it is claimed that 'Hellenistic Corinth accepted an ancient monument (the archaic temple of Apollo) as its focal point, and built itself round it'. There are some interesting remarks on the scenic tendency which is an outstanding feature of Hellenistic architecture in its later developments: among its causes the importance of the theatre, the spread of picturesque Eastern religions, and general grandiosity; one of its most splendid examples the market-front of Miletus, now set up complete in the museum at Berlin.

It was right to stress the debt of the

Renaissance and the present day to Hellenism, though this is a subject, like many in the book, which calls for prolonged study and detailed exposition.

If this modestly-entitled 'introductory study' preserves something of the form of the sheaf of valuable and suggestive notes on which it is based, and

if it will be found more serviceable for reference than easy for continuous reading, that is not wholly the author's fault. When the scope is so wide, a single volume cannot hope to do much more than suggest the world of knowledge which still lies hidden below ground, and above. BERNARD ASHMOLE.

University College, London.

RECENT DISCOVERIES IN ROME.

A. W. VAN BUREN: *Ancient Rome as Revealed by Recent Discoveries*. Pp. xvi + 200; 9 plates, 2 plans. London: Lovat Dickson, 1936. Cloth, 6s.

PROFESSOR VAN BUREN has again earned our gratitude by following up his bibliographical guides to Latium and Southern Etruria, and to Pompeii, with this most useful and comprehensive, though rapid, presentation of the additions of the last fifteen years to our archaeological knowledge of ancient Rome. It is more than a mere compilation, since Professor Van Buren selects whatever is important and brings out its significance in a brief discussion, and communicates something of the freshness of discoveries which he has personally followed. Visitors to the Augustan Exhibition in 1937-8 will find the book invaluable, and for students, for whom Professor Van Buren is chiefly writing, it will be an excellent guide and introduction. In a short space it covers a wide range, from the Velia skull to the early Christian churches, from the vast new excavations to chance finds, from domestic architecture to Oriental religions, and few details of significance escape its mesh. Perhaps the most interesting chapter, however, is that on the apse in the Roman temple, where Professor Van Buren propounds and discusses in greater detail a theory of his own on the origin of the apse. Some of the more general chapters are perhaps too elementary for students, who on the other hand would prefer the seven precious pages of

bibliography in handier form. The references in the text would be more accessible at the foot of the page than crowded at the end of the book in those pages, which for the most part give neither the name of the author nor the title of his book or article, and refer back only to the number of the note and not to that of the page. Hence reference between text and bibliography is not as easy as it might be.

The selection of what is significant, the discussions and comments, are excellent, but a word may be said in criticism of the style, which does not say plain things plainly as a guide should. The author surely is needlessly conscientious in elaborate acknowledgements. The sentences are sometimes clumsy and deadened by clichés, and so italianized as to be not English and even obscure.

The photographs are few and on the whole good, but the general views might have been taken from better vantage-points. III. 1 might have been taken with the sun on it in the afternoon. The temples of the Forum Boarium are already familiar and might have left room for something new, and the skull ('impressive skeletal remain') of I. 2, though important, means little to the student or the tourist.

But these are small cavils which do not detract from the value of the book, which is the best and most comprehensive survey of its field.

C. G. HARDIE.

Magdalen College, Oxford.

THE ATHENIAN EMPIRE.

H. WILLRICH: *Perikles*. Pp. 308. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1936. Paper, RM. 7.50 (bound, 9).

THIS is an interesting book, but it is difficult to see for what class of readers it is intended. It is long and detailed, but in all its 300 closely printed pages there is no reference to authority, no discussion (or almost none) of disputed points, and only a most superficial, though sensible enough, account of the sources; no bibliography other than an expression of debt to a few standard books, to Ehrenberg and to Nesselhauf. Its thesis is that the Delian Confederacy was 'die einzige grosse politische Schöpfung' of the Greek people; and that all opposition or indifference to it was due to narrow-minded selfishness or to lack of understanding—the 'Partikularismus' of other states, and the stupidity of oligarchs in Athens: these oligarchs including Aristophanes and Plato. Thucydides, on the other hand, is its inspired defender and interpreter. To this end Willrich gives in considerable detail an introduction on the century before Pericles (560-460), and a short epilogue on the Peloponnesian War and the fourth century. That a historian should have a definite point of view, that he should try to establish some unity in his theme, is praiseworthy; but Willrich misses more than half the truth about the Greeks. It is not surprising that he misunderstands Pindar as well as Plato and Aristophanes; and his picture of Herodotus in relation to his 'patron,' Pericles, is equally conventional. Pericles himself can do no wrong, either in his public or in his private life; Aspasia, by the primmest standard of morality, is spotless; and the few successes of Athens after his death, under Phormio, Cleon, and Nicias, were all due to his plans. Willrich's narrative is clear, but, by his method, far too positive on doubtful points, not only on dates (for example, the Helot revolt lasting ten years and ending after Tanagra, the ostracism of Damon, the abortive Panhellenic congress), but on many other points as well: of which I

can only give a few examples. He is sure of the names Olbia, Nymphaion and Tanais among the Pontic cities on the assessment-list of 425-4; he is positive that Mnesicles was appointed in charge of the work on the Acropolis before 434 ('in succession to Phidias') because he is so named in the Callias decree, though the date of the decree is still uncertain, Mnesicles' name is a restoration, and the architect is not said to be in general charge in the sense in which Phidias was according to Plutarch. He says that Pericles was never personally a candidate for ostracism, his opponents concentrating on his supporters, such as Damon and Cleippides. He alters one of Thucydides' figures in ii 13 without comment. It is strange to read that Alcamenes and Paeonius were probably the sculptors of the Olympic pediments, that they also worked on the Parthenon pediments, and that the former probably made the Erechtheum Caryatids.

There are a few definite errors, of no great importance, as that Antenor made the sculpture of the Delphi pediment, that the Callias of 450 dedicated the statue of Athena by Endoeus, that Dionysius of Phocaea was admiral of the Greek fleet at Lade, that ἱπποτοξόται could not be citizens; that children of foreign mothers—before 451—were at a disadvantage in the sphere of family law (did not Cimon succeed to his father's assets and liabilities?). ὑπὸ τοῦ πρώτου ἀνδρὸς ἀρχή is hardly 'die Herrschaft des besten Mannes.' Willrich is right in his argument that work on the Erechtheum was not renewed in order to help unemployed citizens; but he is very misleading when he says: 'die Bürger erscheinen hier nur als Maler und Bildhauer, nie als Handlanger. Als solche dienen nur Metöken und Sklaven.'

More serious is the omission of the background to the story—no geography, no social history, and no adequate account of the working of the Athenian constitution. Yet in many interesting and disputed points I find Willrich's judgement sound: as on the peace of

Callias, the treaty with Chalcis in 446, the 'refusal' of Athens to extend her citizenship to her subjects (though he forgets the constitutional aspect of this), the social relationship between Pericles and Phidias; his instinct is right about chapter 24 of the *Constitution of Athens*. The weakness of the book is that it is one-sided: that is, granted that his view that the empire was a fine attempt

to solve the Greek political problem is correct (and I, for one, agree in this), he does not properly appreciate what Pericles had to struggle against—especially the fact that Athens too, and Pericles as an Athenian, wished to preserve the city-state form.

A. W. GOMME.

University of Glasgow.

A HISTORY OF GREECE.

N. P. VLACHOS: *Hellas and Hellenism: Social and Cultural History of Ancient Greece*. Pp. vii+428; illustrations. Boston, London, etc.: Ginn, 1936. Cloth, 12s. 6d.

DR. VLACHOS has attempted another short interpretation of Greek history; but not, I think, a successful one. He reviews every branch of Greek activity, but stops short at 338 B.C., where for him the essential Greece ends, so that Aristotle—even his political theory—is outside his limit. His view is that the Greeks did not really outgrow the tribal condition, that therefore for them the state was everything, that all activity, not only what was political in the narrow sense, but industry, art, letters, philosophy, were all subordinated to the ends of the state: the citizen was made for the state, not the state for the citizen (no wonder Aristotle is left out). The *Republic* was not a criticism of Athens, except in unessentials, but an ideal to which all Greeks would have assented; Sparta, in this respect, did not differ from Athens. Education, not far removed from the tribal stage, was directly the concern of the state and wholly under its control. But how do the careers of men such as Pindar and Simonides and the great sculptors and painters fit in with such a theory? or, what is more important, the intellectual outlook of Aeschylus or Sophocles—even though they spent their lives in Athens and produced their plays at state festivals? Art and letters were more public, more social in Greece than they have been in most countries; but that is a very different matter, and Dr. Vlachos does not distinguish. Nor does he discuss the problem, in this connexion,

of Greek religion: that though, in a sense, there was a state religion in every city, yet none of the gods was confined to any one city, but all were common to all; nor that in the great festivals like Olympia there was not a gathering of state representatives, but of individuals from all over the Greek world (no state totted up the total number of points won by its citizens in the *agones*, as they do in the modern Olympic games). And though he attempts it, he does not succeed in reconciling his two statements 'Homer's interpretation of life lies at the basis of all that is Hellenic' and 'there was no room in the Hellenic polis for the reckless self-assertion' that was the principal characteristic of the Homeric hero.

He has much of interest to say by the way, and especially shows an appreciation (often lacking in others) of the significance of the Peloponnesian war. But he also has many misconceptions and some errors, which, being conventional, suggest an unreceptive mind: 'Both Alcman, the Greek, and Goethe, the German poet, have given in lyric verse a wonderful description of the stillness of the night. . . . The German poem ends: *Warte nur, balde ruhest du auch*. That is, Goethe reads into the stillness of the night a message to his own weary heart. Now this last line, which to us contains the very essence of the lyric, is lacking in Alcman, and we shall look for it in vain in all Hellenic poetry.' Yet he has himself referred to Simonides' ode on Danae on a previous page. 'The instinctive thirst of the Aegean for beauty is tempered by the sober rationalism of the Northerner'; yet the rationalism of Greek architecture

and sculpture is, in the same chapter, contrasted with the romanticism and mystical beauty of northern art. Nor can I reconcile Sophocles' sense of tragic greatness—'Life is great only because it is tragic. Antigone is greater than Ismene; Electra greater than Chrysothemis; and even Ajax, taking his own life, greater than the worldly-wise Odysseus'—with the 'Greek rationalist attitude towards morality' which Dr. Vlachos has expounded in an earlier chapter: how Greek morality 'remained a tribal morality down to the

end,' and how their word for *good* implies reference to a purpose, *good for what?* and *ἀγαθία* is only aiming well, but missing the mark; and so forth. Even the more trifling errors, such as 'Attica was politically united under Athens,' and 'now that Greek mountain-sides are entirely denuded of their forests,' are of the kind that at once suggest doubt of the value of the book. Surely a man of Dr. Vlachos' name should not have made this last mistake.

A. W. GOMME.

University of Glasgow.

SULLA THE DICTATOR.

CAROLINA LANZANI: *Lucio Cornelio Silla Dittatore*. Pp. xx+382; 91 photographs. Milan: Hoepli, 1936. Paper, L. 75.

IN this handsomely produced volume, which is a sequel to her book entitled *Mario e Silla*, Professor Lanzani completes her study of Sulla. She reviews his dictatorship at considerable length, and not without much repetition in her narrative. She contributes useful detail on the topography of his colonies and on his judicial reforms, and she provides an interesting excursus on his tutelary deity Venus. But the main feature of her book is her frankly eulogistic tone in regard to the dictator. Taking a middle line between the critics who dub Sulla a purblind reactionary and those who regard him as an unsuccessful pioneer of monarchy, she sets him in a more favourable light as a conservative reformer.

There is much to commend this verdict on Sulla's work, but Professor Lanzani is inclined to overrate Sulla's services and to minimize his faults. She endeavours to cast a share of responsibility for the proscriptions upon the Senate, though there is nothing to indicate that this body gave Sulla any moral support in his policy of reprisals; and her plea that Sulla was borne along by a 'suprema necessità' or a 'movente astratto' reads like a counsel of despair. It is equally difficult to believe that Sulla obeyed some 'humanitarian or equalitarian' impulse when he enfranchised 10,000 slaves of the proscribed.

Not even the Stoic philosophers called for such active displays of philanthropy; and Sulla was an Epicurean or nothing.

The author makes a good point in emphasizing the stimulus which Sulla's colonies gave to the unification of Italy. But is it possible to maintain that without these settlements Italy would have remained a geographical expression? The paradox of the Social War, in which Italians fought Rome for the Roman franchise, is surely proof that the process of amalgamation was already far advanced before Sulla imparted a final spurt to it. Again, Professor Lanzani is no doubt right in holding that the new peers whom Sulla introduced into the Senate were wisely chosen from the more reputable elements of the Equester Ordo; but she goes too far in claiming that these eventually leavened the whole assembly. In the Ciceronian age the old nobility notoriously recovered its monopoly of high office and thereby maintained its ascendancy in the Senate, for the men of consular and praetorian standing had the right of first speech in the House and usually determined the issue of a debate.

Nevertheless, Professor Lanzani's chivalrous attempt to vindicate Sulla deserves recognition as a wholesome corrective to the more or less unconscious bias which the dictator's long list of traducers, ancient and modern, may have engendered in us.

One point of lesser detail in this book raises a point of some importance in

relation to our sources for Roman History. The author contends that the *γραφή* which Appian quoted to prove that the title 'Felix' was conferred upon Sulla by the Senate (I. ch. 97) was discovered by Appian himself among the *acta Senatus*. But Appian, who never rose above the rank of 'procura-

tor', had no access to the senatorial archives, and in any case he was not given to independent research. Presumably he drew upon a biography of Sulla, of the same type as Suetonius' *Lives of the Caesars*.

M. CARY.

University of London.

THE ROMAN WORLD FROM ANTONINUS TO CONSTANTINE.

H. M. D. PARKER: *A History of the Roman World from A.D. 138 to 337*. Pp. xii+402; 4 folding maps. London: Methuen, 1935. Cloth boards, 15s.

THIS book carries on the History of the Greek and Roman World, of which Dr. M. Cary is the editor, from the death of Hadrian to that of Constantine the Great. The general student now has in his hands for the first time a description of these two centuries which takes adequate account of the growing volume of evidence furnished by coins, inscriptions, and excavation. Mr. Parker's treatment, with one or two exceptions to be noted presently, will commend itself as a balanced and judicious picture. The full documentation greatly enhances its value.

For one thing in particular we must be grateful to the author: he has relegated to its proper place the mass of improbable scandal which doubtless made writers like Suetonius and the Augustan biographers best sellers in their time, and has passed on most of it the righteous judgement of oblivion.

I have detected few errors, and the book is almost entirely free from misprints. The assistance which the secretary Epaphroditus gave Nero (p. 55) in driving home the second and fatal blow of the dagger can hardly be called assassination.

The title of Pius conferred on Antoninus is described as a tribute to his reverence for the gods. Capitolinus suggests four reasons, but this is not one of them. The name might recognize his protection of senators from Hadrian's cruelty. *Pietas* was a reciprocal virtue (Hor. *Ep.* I, 18, 26 *piamater*); Cyprian (*de Orat.*) says that God answers prayer by reason of His

pietas. The prominence given to the title by subsequent emperors suggests that it may have been associated with the idea of the *pater patriae* (as in Tertull. *Apol.* 34).

Too little importance is given to endemic malaria, in comparison with epidemics of plague (p. 20), as a cause of the decline of the empire. Plague would not, like malaria, permanently infect and debilitate the surviving population. Athens and seventeenth-century Europe made wonderful recoveries.

The sentence (p. 42) 'Belief in the State deities was dead or dying and the old animistic religion, if it lingered in the country-side . . .' is surely much too sweeping. It leaves unaccounted for the prominence of Olympian types on coins, the mass appeal to the *di conservatores* on the later coinage of Gallienus, passages like Augustine *de Civ. Dei* iv 8, and the whole body of Christian satire and criticism. Christian writers themselves believed in the pagan 'demons.' Life is more like a palimpsest than a series of writings on clean slates, and in Mediterranean countries the original writing still shows through.

Pupienus Maximus (pp. 146-7) is called Maximus throughout. He uses both names together on some of his coins, but on a large majority that of Pupienus only. It seems better to adopt the one he preferred.

Westminster Abbey and the Roman Emperors are being cleaned and white-washed simultaneously. Mr. Robert Graves recently did this service for Claudius I, but unfortunately left him, like the British Museum cameo of Augustus, on a blacker background than ever. Mr. Parker extends the process to Gallienus. He represents

him rather as a capable and cultured ruler, and a man of ideas, struggling with overwhelming adversity.

The traditional estimate is that of an able leader in the field—the aspect which Zosimus stresses—but a bad emperor and man. In the latter judgement the western writers all concur. The new portrait deserves careful consideration on account of the low quality of the existing literary sources; but Victor's summary—'ut quisque pessimus erit, par similisque semper ipsi habebitur'—reads curiously beside Mr. Parker's chapter. Victor is not dependent on the Augustan biographies, to which he adds various details, and differs from them in important particulars. It is one thing to reduce a sentence, quite another to reverse a verdict. Aristotle (*Poetics* II) says that 'Polygnotus depicted men as nobler than they are, Pauson as less noble, Dionysius drew them true to life.' Victor and Trebellius Pollio may very possibly be like Pauson,

but I am far from convinced that Mr. Parker is Dionysius.

The account of the revolt of mint workers against Aurelian (pp. 196-7) conceals a much wider discontent. It is incredible that there were anything like as many employed in the Roman mint as the mere total (7,000) of casualties quoted. The large number of hoards of money belonging to the period of Gallienus indicates a drastic devaluation in terms of Aurelian's new coinage, and there can be little doubt that the insurgents were the owners of savings which a stroke of the pen had reduced to a fraction of their nominal worth.

The later chapters contain a valuable study of the growth of the Super-State, and the ever-increasing burden of the bureaucracy on the private citizen. They leave the reader with a feeling that this period of the Roman empire ought to be made a regular subject in the schools of all democracies.

F. S. SALISBURY.

AN ECONOMIC SURVEY OF ROMAN EGYPT.

Allan Chester JOHNSON: *Roman Egypt to the Reign of Diocletian*. (Vol. II of *An Economic Survey of Ancient Rome*, edited by T. Frank.) Pp. x+732. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press (London: Milford), 1936. Cloth, 18s.

As explained in the introduction to Vol. I of this valuable series, Egypt occupied so exceptional a position in the Graeco-Roman world and the evidence for its economic history is so peculiarly full that in a volume devoted to it a special method of treatment was called for. Professor Johnson, to whom this volume was entrusted, has performed his task admirably, and has produced a work which will be invaluable to all students of the subject and is likely to be in constant use by papyrologists. The arrangement is clear and logical, beginning, as any economic study of Egypt should begin, with the land, on which the whole economy of the country was based; and the survey is laudably comprehensive, the selection of illustrative texts both ample and judicious. Certain criticisms of the

plan may indeed be made. It is a really serious omission that no list or table of the papyri quoted is included; and though the table of contents at the beginning may enable the enquirer, with some trouble, to discover where any particular papyrus is to be found, the waste of time involved will impair the value of the book as a work of papyrological reference. It is vexatious also that no explanation of the system of reference to the texts quoted is given. Where, as is usually the case, it is that of the *Archiv für Papyrusforschung*, this will not matter to papyrologists, though it may perplex others who consult the volume; but sometimes the author follows a system of his own. Thus, the papyri edited by Kalén in his *Berliner Leihgabe griechischer Papyri* are referred to not as 'P. Berl. Leihgabe', which is the recognized compendium, but as 'P. Upps.' (a most inappropriate form, since the papyri were merely lent to Uppsala). 'SPP' stands for the *Studien zur Palaeographie und Papyruskunde*; but not everybody will recognize in

TAPA the *Transactions of the American Philological Association*. Finally, the index is far from adequate.

Apart from these faults however the plan of the volume deserves high praise. The texts are so numerous that it was impracticable to quote them in the original, and translations are throughout given instead. Wherever possible those of the original editors are used; in other cases Professor Johnson makes his own. These seem accurate on the whole, and are well and clearly phrased, but I have noticed some loose and a few not quite accurate renderings. Thus, 'abroad' is a misleading translation of *ἐν ἀλλοδαπή* (p. 120, l. 2); the meaning is, as correctly given lower down, 'in other districts' (so too on p. 253, l. 2, 'abroad,' l. 5, 'in foreign lands,' both misrepresent the Greek). Again, in his translation of the Marmarica papyrus (p. 60 ff.) he renders *πρασιά* as 'meadow'; the meaning appears actually to be a cultivated plot of ground.

Not only is the selection of texts very representative and the arrangement good, but a most invaluable feature of

the volume is the inclusion of lists of the documents of each class. Thus there is on pp. 83 ff. a summary of the provisions of land leases in chronological order; and almost every subject is similarly illustrated. The lists of prices, wages and 'miscellaneous costs and accounts' (pp. 469 ff.) will be particularly valuable to economists, and not less useful are the classified tables of taxes in chapter IV.

Naturally, in so big a volume there are points which call for correction and others which at least provoke question; but most of these affect matters of detail rather than broad principles (thus, on p. 291, l. 17, 'Coptic' should be 'demitic'; on pp. 27, 28 *γῆ δωρεά*—as if *δωρεά* were an adjective—should be *γῆ δωρεᾶς*; on p. 357, l. 19, *χειρογραφία* is rather a declaration under oath than a contract); and such blemishes do not seriously diminish the solid value of a work which will long rank as a standard authority on its subject.

H. I. BELL.

British Museum.

THE LEGENDS OF ATHOS.

R. M. DAWKINS: *The Monks of Athos*.

Pp. 398; 1 map, 6 plates, 7 drawings.

London: Allen and Unwin, 1936.

Cloth, 15s.

PROFESSOR DAWKINS has made a corpus of the *ἱεροὶ λόγοι* current in Athos, some previously recorded, many collected by himself on his numerous visits. To students of legend this well-documented collection will be of the greatest value. The legends are arranged by monasteries and according to the historical events with which they are (often impossibly) connected; legends of the foundations and of the Emperors, and of the dangers, miraculously averted, that arose from the hated Latins, the pirates and the 'Turks'. To this is prefixed an extremely interesting account of the history, organisation and politics of Athos—not to mention its flowers—which the author thinks 'somewhat arid'. It is not.

The legends are mainly of the familiar

type—the mysterious arrival of the icon, the attempt to put it into the existing church, the refusal of the icon to stay there, the building of a new church to protect it, and its subsequent long thaumaturgic history. The reflections of historical events that are brought in are quite random, for the Athonite world has a time-system other than ours; it has no more objection to connecting Constantine the Great with an eleventh-century foundation than it has to making a hermit work a miracle against an American and an unholy camera.

To the non-specialist the legends in the mass become monotonous because of their singleness of aim and method—the dramatic story of the Gerondissa, the Aged Virgin (?), which stands out for its 'human interest', is rejected by Dawkins, and clearly with reason. On the other hand, the author is most successful in conveying the flavour of Greek monastic life, so remote (and at

least in small doses) so fascinating. Especially is he alive to that ancient stratum which underlies the Byzantine in Greece, the instinct for plastic expression and for reason. Πειθῶ still moves the gods. St. George and St. Dimitrios on an icon pray to Christ not in complete surrender, like the Western saints, but claiming τὸ δίκαιον; the pious doctor in distress says to St. Dimitrios 'Is this the way to treat your servant?' Ἀρ' ἔχει καλῶς;

Greek historians may note that there is a current which will carry wooden votive-offerings from Chios to Symi in four months, an interesting foundation in fact for the innumerable stories of miraculously seafaring icons. The book is enriched by some extremely vigorous drawings by a monk, Niphon, and the map by an odd misprint, millimetres for kilometres.

H. D. F. KITTO.

University of Glasgow.

THE BIRTH OF THE MIDDLE AGES.

H. ST. L. B. MOSS: *The Birth of the Middle Ages*, 395-814. Pp. xviii + 291; 8 plates, 10 maps. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1935. Cloth, 12s. 6d.

THIS book will stand with Mr. Christopher Dawson's *The Making of Europe* as one of the best popular treatments of a most difficult period. It is a work of distinction, written in a tranquil, easy prose, concise, but never superficial. Its distinguishing mark is its approach to Western history from the Mediterranean, indeed the Eastern Mediterranean, rather than from Northern France or Germany; and from Constantinople the view of the early Middle Ages is somewhat different. It is a view from a fixed point in a world of westward-surging peoples; it makes one see that the survival of Roman culture, of Roman discipline and order, was in no small degree due to the Byzantine Empire, and that, without this obstinate Mediterranean bulwark, the contours of the Middle Ages would not have been as we know them to-day. Mr. Moss's view is not purely political. That he has a real

grasp of the artistic elements can be seen from his chapter on the Origins of Christian Art, where a very difficult problem has been deftly handled. Antioch, Alexandria, and the tradition of the Asiatic nomad cultures which Strzygowski has emphasized, are all woven into the picture, and yet the essential Byzantinism of the art is convincingly displayed. On several points, but one especially, the book will be valuable in the hands of any student about to read Bury: the religious factor is not omitted from this book; nor is it overemphasized. Religion, as Mr. Moss sees it, ran 'like a cross-section through the whole of Byzantine life.' 'Our topic of conversation is the weather; theirs was theology.' It is natural therefore that Mr. Moss should feel at home when he comes to Islam; but I should like to see his pages on Islam's dogmatic theology (169-70) greatly expanded, for such treatment would explain much to medievalists working upon early scholasticism.

E. F. JACOB.

University of Manchester.

E. S. FORSTER and T. B. L. WEBSTER: *An Anthology of Greek Verse*. Pp. 183. Manchester: University Press, 1935. Cloth, 4s. THIS companion volume to the same editors' *Anthology of Greek Prose* (C.R. XLVIII. 149) should be useful to those who want something on a smaller scale than the *Oxford Book of Greek Verse*. On the whole, the passages are well chosen, though one misses a few good things: Πῶλε Θρηκίη, for example, and Simonides' Thermopylae ode. Apollonius gets as much space as Theocritus (an extract from the

Pharmakeutria might have been included); and the deeper side of Aristophanes' poetry might have been illustrated from the *Lysistrata*.

The extracts are sometimes too short. Andromache's lament and Odysseus' speech to Nausicaa need the passages leading up to them. Both are truncated, and so is Medea's speech to her children. Hesiod's description of winter stops short before it fairly gets going (the editors start, unnecessarily, at 492). We miss the delightful picture of the girl lying

snug in bed after her hot bath, and other pleasant things. The editors' objects are 'to produce a selection which can be used for Unseen Translation and for illustrating a course of lectures on Greek Literature.' But passages short enough for the first purpose are apt to lack that relative completeness which one has a right to expect even in an anthology.

Professor Forster's introduction is adequate, though it contains one or two doubtful statements. Is it true that the interest of the *Ion* is 'romantic rather than psychological,' or that Euripides' use of prologue and *deus ex machina* is due to 'carelessness'? Professor Forster jumps from Thespis to Aeschylus with not a word of Phrynichus, the first living figure among the Greek tragedians.

J. D. DENNISTON.

Hertford College, Oxford.

PAUL MAZON: *Madame Dacier et les traductions d'Homère en France*. Pp. 27. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1936. Paper, 2s.

IN this interesting lecture Professor Mazon traces the history of Homeric translations in France from Jehan Samxon's version of the *Iliad* published in 1530 to the present day. He points out with justice that 'un traducteur d'Homère devient en même temps un témoin du goût de son époque. . . . Pour traduire Homère, il faut un parti pris. Ce parti pris, jusqu'au XIX^e siècle, dépendait avant tout des conceptions esthétiques et sociales du temps.' Madame Dacier's translation, made in the classical period of French literature, is one of the great literary monuments of the reign of Louis XIV. The lecturer characterizes her merits as naturalness, simplicity and *honnêteté*.

By means of examples Professor Mazon shows the methods adopted by a long series of translators, discussing in particular the difficulty of rendering Homer's compound epithets in an analytical language like French, and the question of the use of archaic language. He concludes with a tribute to the late Victor Bérard as a scholar and translator of Homer.

EDWARD S. FORSTER.

University of Sheffield.

M. K. FLICKINGER: *The 'Apapria of Sophocles' Antigone*. Pp. 82. (Iowa Studies in Classical Philology, No. II.) Iowa: State University, 1935. Paper, \$1.25.

THIS essay is modestly written and easy to read. It cannot indeed claim to be an important contribution to learning. Mrs. Flickinger has little that is new to say about Aristotle's doctrine, and she seems too ready to assume that its meaning is clear and its truth self-evident. Nor is her analysis of the *Antigone*, particularly of the character-drawing, sufficiently subtle to do justice to the play. She is too lenient to Creon's tyrannous stupidity, too ready to accept the utterances of the Chorus as an expression of the dramatist's own view; she underestimates the importance of the Haemon episode and is too harsh in her judgment of Antigone's attitude to Ismene. But it is always interesting and stimulating to hear

what an intelligent modern woman feels about an ancient tragic heroine's behaviour, and on one important point Mrs. Flickinger makes a suggestion which is certainly plausible and well worth making, and which seems to the present writer likely to be true. She holds that by the first symbolic burial-rites Antigone does all that piety to heaven and to her brother requires, so that her return to the body for the performance of fresh ritual becomes a work of supererogation, an act of headstrong defiance, the assertion of a rebellious personality, a deliberate courting of disaster. I think Mrs. Flickinger somewhat exaggerates this aspect of Antigone's character, but her account of the matter deserves serious consideration, and her essay is worth more than many more elaborate doctoral dissertations because it is a candid statement of an intelligent young reader's personal impression of the play.

J. T. SHEPPARD.

King's College, Cambridge.

Platone: *Il Simposio*, con introduzione e commento di UMBERTO GALLI. Pp. cxxxiii + 242. Turin: Chiantore, 1935. Paper, L.30.

THIS edition of the *Symposium* appears in the series *Biblioteca di Filologia Classica* under the general editorship of G. de Sanctis and E. A. Rostagni. A very full introduction, reviewing the general background and subject-matter and outlining the development of the discussion, is followed by a closer analysis of the argument, and by an 'Appendix Critica' summarizing the main variant readings. The text (Burnet's with few divergences) follows, with the commentary in accompanying footnotes. A mere table of contents completes the volume; a real index would have added much to its value.

The editor has done his work thoroughly and with insight and sympathy as well as erudition. In the introduction, the general topic of *êpos* is well discussed and the place of the dialogue in Plato's system is made clear, with special reference to the *Lysis*, *Phaedo* and *Phaedrus*. Considerable space is given, both here and in the notes, to appreciation of the literary quality of Plato's writing. The commentary is full and sound; instances, taken at random, of very good notes are those on *παῖζων* at the outset (172A), *διωκίσθημεν* (193A), and *δαίμων* (202D). Occasionally the matter presented might have been better arranged; as when, after two long and excellent notes (on 197C and 198D) enlarging on the 'Gorgias style,' we are briefly told who Gorgias was. Justice is done to the philosophic doctrine embodied in the speech of Socrates, and to the description of *αὐτὸ τὸ καλόν* in its bearing on the Theory of Ideas. But the main interest of the commentary is historical and literary. Grammatical points are elucidated where necessary, and there are some very interesting notes on anacolutha and other matters of style (see, for instance, on 200B). Altogether this is a valuable edition, full of excellent things and a real enrichment of the literature of the *Symposium*.

D. TARRANT.

Bedford College, London.

HELMUT KUHN: *Sokrates: ein Versuch über den Ursprung der Metaphysik*. Pp. 161. Berlin: 'Die Runde,' 1934. Cloth.

IT is with hesitation that I judge a book which, I suspect, would render up its secrets more fully to one habituated *ἐκ νέου* in the German language.

If the career of Socrates were a mere series of distant events from which we inherited nothing, its study would be *Vergangenheitsgeschichte*, and would be limited by the documentary evidence which survives. Judging his career thus, we must all be sceptics; who shall draw the line of division between his opinions and Plato's? If, however, his thought goes on surviving and evolving in other minds, its study is also *Urgeschichte*—an enquiry into the origin and ancestry of a real fact present to us. This avenue may take us further than the first. The problem is to know what questions Socrates asked; and we can throw light on it by asking: to what questions is the Ontology of Plato an appropriate answer? Hence Mr. Kuhn's subtitle.

How, I wonder, does he visualize our freedom to use this second method? Surely we never know that the silence and helplessness of *Vergangenheitsgeschichte* are final; and our freedom suffers if, as I surmise, the last word on a point of detail will always rest with this formidable matron? The prospective reader should be referred to the final chapter for these questions of method. D. J. ALLAN.

Balliol College, Oxford.

JOSEPH WERRES: *Die Beteuerungsformeln in der attischen Komödie*. Inaugural-Dissertation, Bonn. Pp. 48. Würzburg: Tritsch, 1936. Paper.

THIS examination of the formulæ beginning with *νῆ* and *μά*, and to some extent of those containing *νῆος* c. gen., is undertaken from a linguistic point of view, in order to determine the nature of the syntactical contexts within which these formulæ are used. The writer has evidently made a very complete collection of the facts, from which he communicates to his readers only such as are necessary to substantiate his conclusions. His work shows him to possess an acute intellect, and in a number of places he gives reasons for particular punctuations of disputed passages, or for redistribution of the lines among the speakers, which deserve the attention of future editors of the comedies and fragments. Here and there I have been unconvinced, especially by his (mainly metrical) argument in favour of admitting the reality of *νῆ* *Δί* in a number of places where our editions have *νῆ* *Δία* or *νῆ* *Δι'*. R. MCKENZIE.

Oxford.

ANTON ANTWEILER: *Der Begriff der Wissenschaft bei Aristoteles* (No. 1 of a series *Grenzfragen zwischen Theologie und Philosophie*). Pp. 120. Bonn: Hanstein, 1936. Paper, M. 3.80.

DR. ANTWEILER'S object is to provide the introduction to a new series of works on problems which are fundamental to the theologian, such

as the nature of Belief. For the solution of most or all of such problems, we need some conception of Knowledge; Aristotle's has here been chosen owing to its historical importance and its emphasis on experience. The author has presented the Aristotelian doctrine mostly in quotations, which are woven together by a careful and often very concise argument; and he does not aspire either to novelty or to exhaustiveness. His book is, I think, admirably suited to its purpose.

We have to put to ourselves the following questions: Had Aristotle a clearly defined idea of Knowledge, or does he at least provide material for such an idea? In the former case, was his idea the product of gradual growth, or is it already clear in his earliest writings? To what extent can it lay claim to general validity? As regards the first question, Dr. Antweiler sees in Aristotle a man who is always consciously in search of such a definition, but never thinks he has secured it. Knowledge is apprehension of universal truth, and of that which exists of necessity; knowledge is also 'a state of capacity to demonstrate.' The two descriptions do not coincide; one rests on the fact that the objects of Knowledge are unchanging, the other on the nature of thought; they might be combined in the form 'knowledge is the capacity to know universal truth by means of demonstration,' and certainly Aristotle gropes his way towards a definition of this kind; but it is typical of him to regard no answer as final, and to be cautious of transferring conclusions from one environment to another. To the question whether this account of knowledge has any general validity outside the Aristotelian system, Dr. Antweiler gives a somewhat curious answer. He objects that Aristotle, although he attaches value to the individual, thinks that individuals can only be *known* as the bearers of universal qualities; therefore the road to knowledge, according to him, is by simplification and abstraction; in order to have knowledge we must renounce fullness and concreteness. I do not think there is anything strange in this account; for the knowledge of individuals 'by acquaintance' does not come within the scope of Aristotle's discussion; and abstractness is a necessary feature of the scientific knowledge he has in mind. D. J. ALLAN.

Balliol College, Oxford.

M. TIERNEY: *Aristotle and Menander*. Pp. 14. (Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy, Vol. XLIII, Section C, No. 6.) Dublin: Hodges, Figgis, and Co. (London: Williams and Norgate), 1936. Paper, 1s.

THIS article was well worth printing separately. It draws attention to the many points of contact between the doctrines or sentiments expressed by Aristotle and Menander respectively, and attributes them mostly to the influence of Aristotle and Theophrastus upon the poet. It affords an interesting study in the moral terminology and ideas of the middle and later part of the fourth century, but discussion of the points raised would require a good deal of space. I cannot agree with the writer every-

where in his interpretations of the *Poetics*, and I doubt whether what appear to be technical terms are used as strictly in that work as in the *Ethics* and *Metaphysics*; but the questions which he raises are all worth raising (though some are not new), and his consideration of them is accompanied by the necessary references. I suspect that the greater number of moral reflections in Menander came to him without the assistance of any philosopher at all, as similar reflections do to quite ordinary men still.

A. W. PICKARD-CAMBRIDGE.

University of Sheffield.

Plotin: *Ennéades* VI (1re partie): Texte établi et traduit par ÉMILE BRÉHIER. Pp. 213. Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres,' 1936. Paper, 30 francs.

IN this volume, containing *Ennead* VI i-v, I have noted nine emendations and thirty-one suggested emendations. Of the emendations the following seem probable: VI i, 12 l. 33 for *δντος ἡ καθ' ὅσον ποιοῦν*; read *όντος*; 'H. . . ποιοῦν'; ib. 16 l. 34 for *οὐ καὶ read οὐκ*; ib. 20 l. 4 for *τοῦ ποιοῦ read τοῦ ποιοῦ <ντος>*; VI ii, 3 l. 13 for *αὐτὰ read αὐτὸ*; VI iii, 6 l. 18 <*ἀλλ'*> *ὡς ἂν*; ib. 19 l. 25 for *τὸ μὲν ἐρυθρίαν read τὸν μὲν ἐρυθρίαν*.

Of the suggested emendations some are good, e.g. at VI i, 20 l. 29; VI ii, 14 l. 13; VI iii, 23 l. 12. Many are unnecessary. Several would impair the text, e.g. at VI i, 10 l. 48; ib. 29, l. 2; ib. l. 5; on VI i, 10 l. 37 Bréhier says '*ἴσχυν* [accent!]: verbum oppositum *διαθέσει*, *στέρησιν* ex. *causa*, *expectaveris*,' failing to notice that *ἴσχυν* > <*ἀσθένειαν* is parallel to *ὑγίειαν* > <*νόσον*.

The translation, which, inevitably, is often merely a paraphrase, is marred by many mistranslations, e.g. in the first treatise c. 1 l. 3 f.; 11 l. 25 ff.; 19 l. 5 f.; 20 l. 2 f.; ib. l. 14 f.; 22 l. 14; ib. l. 23.

In general, this volume preserves the features of the earlier volumes: the introductions to the different treatises, giving a careful analysis of Plotinus' argument with references to the relevant passages of Plato and Aristotle; the useful, but rather spasmodic, notes (in addition, on VI i and iii there are references below the text to the relevant passages of Simplicius and Dexippus); and the numerous misprints and other errors—the breathings are very often wrong; at least one short passage is omitted (*οἱ δ' ἄλλοι* in VI i, 1 l. 3); the words and punctuation of the text at times differ from those which are translated; in the critical notes the accents are very often wrong and the number of the line is sometimes wrongly given or omitted; on VI i, 23 ll. 11-14 Bréhier says '*oratio manca* Volkman,' whereas it is 24 *init.* that V. calls '*oratio manca*'; finally, on VI ii, 3 l. 14 he suggests and translates a reading which spoils the syntax, but apparently fails to notice this fact.

M. J. BOYD.

Queen's University, Belfast.

Sextus Empiricus, with an English translation by R. G. BURY. III. Pp. 556. (Loeb Classical Library.) London: Heinemann, 1936. Cloth, 10s. (leather, 12s. 6d.)

THE third and final volume of Dr. Bury's Sextus, containing *adv. M.* IX-XI, happily returns to the standards of the first (*C.R.* XLVIII. p. 198, XLIX. p. 225), and he is to be congratulated on the achievement of what must often have been a laborious task. Many people will be glad to skim Sextus in Dr. Bury's English rather than his own undistinguished Greek, or to turn to the Indexes of Names and Subjects. This volume also contains a number of suggestions for the improvement of the text.

A few miscellaneous comments:—IX. 72-3: *πολύ πρότερον* is 'much more,' not 'still earlier,' and a note of warning on *ἐκσκοπνοὶ ἡλίου* would not have been amiss. 363: Asclepiades' *ἀναρμοὶ ὄγκοι* were hardly 'irregular molecules,' but perhaps 'masses without sutures or divisions,' i.e. homogeneous as e.g. a drop of water *appears* to be, but, like the drop, divisible into fragments capable of recombination (for the evidence and other views see Heidehl, *T.A.P.A.* 40, p. 5, and Zeller III. 1. 571 n. 4). XI. 11: 'if' should be 'since.' 30 and 61: *συλλαμβανόμενον* is probably right, but to alter it to *συμβαλλόμενον* in one place only must be wrong. 66: The illogical *ὅτι in μάλλον . . . ἢ ὅτι* is supported by I. 195 and IX. 66. 75 and 171: *οὐκέτι* is 'not however,' not 'no longer.' Finally, what animals 'haunt the crags for the sake of drinking' (126)?

I very much regret that in my review of the second volume I proposed in correction of Dr. Bury's translation of VII. 27 a version which is impossible without a textual change. Also *ἐλκώδης ἀφή* (VII. 175) is probably no more than 'soreness to the touch'; see the symptoms of fever as described by Galen VII. 176-9.

F. H. SANDBACH.

Trinity College, Cambridge.

CLAES BLUM: *Studies in the Dream-Book of Artemidorus*. Pp. 108. Uppsala: Almqvist & Wicksell, 1936. Paper.

THE best part of this pamphlet, which is its author's inaugural dissertation, is that which deals with text and style. Artemidoros of Daldis lived in the second century A.D.; he was a would-be scientific interpreter of dreams; he therefore wrote in the usual medium of men of science, literary Hellenistic, not Attic, though he attices a little. In 1864, when Hercher's edition, the only modern one, came out, this was not so clear as it is now, and consequently the text has suffered somewhat from burking of words and phrases which would be quite out of place if this were a treatise of Theophrastos, for instance, still more one by an early Socratic. Dr. Blum examines the MS. evidence, which he plausibly reduces to the testimony of two codices, V and L, the rest being copies at one or more removes of these. Starting from the resulting text, he collects a number of words and locutions characteristically Hellenistic, some typical of writers on divination, but few rare

or in any way surprising. If he intends to edit this author, and it is time there was a new text, he has laid no despicable foundation.

It is to be hoped he will add a commentary; for, although Artemidoros is neither philosophy, psychology nor folklore, yet he has enough connection with all three to be interesting to more than one type of reader. More study of the scantily-known ideas of the period will probably rid Dr. Blum of a Poseidonios-complex from which he at present suffers rather acutely, though showing welcome signs of amelioration when he recognizes (p. 76) that some things in the dream-book are nothing but the common-places of rhetorical classification. Doubtless he will also continue what he has begun (pp. 94-104), a study of the relations between the Daldian's method of interpretation and sundry popular and semi-popular ideas, ranging from the significance of the heavenly bodies to the difference of right and left.

St. Andrews.

H. J. ROSE.

WILLIAM HENRY PAINE HATCH: *The Greek Manuscripts of the New Testament at Mount Sinai. Facsimiles and Descriptions*. Pp. 12+85; 2 photographs, 78 plates. *The Greek Manuscripts of the New Testament in Jerusalem. Facsimiles and Descriptions*. Pp. 12+71; 2 photographs, 66 plates. (American Schools of Oriental Research, Publications of the Jerusalem School, Vols. I, II). Paris: Geuthner, 1932, 1934. Stiff boards, each vol. 150 fr.

PROFESSOR HATCH, of Cambridge, Massachusetts, has rendered many valuable services to the study of the New Testament, but it may be doubted whether he has produced any work of more importance than these volumes. These two collections have been visited by Tischendorf, Gregory, and various British scholars, but we have hitherto had to be content with descriptions of such MSS as scholars had time to examine. By publishing these admirable facsimiles, which are of manageable size, being about 10" by 6½", and are yet perfectly clear, he has also given the student of Greek minuscule new tools, the value of which it would be hard to exaggerate. It adds to the interest of the volumes that they contain photographs of St Catharine's Convent at Mount Sinai, A Corner in the Convent Library, the Greek Patriarchal Library in Jerusalem, and An Interior View of the Greek Patriarchal Library in Jerusalem. A cream-coloured paper is used which suggests the appearance of the original pages very well.

The descriptions give all the usual particulars that we expect the modern catalogue to furnish. It may be mentioned that Hatch exercises his own judgment in dating the MSS, and sometimes disagrees with earlier datings. Apart from palaeographical particulars, the student of the New Testament will find just the information he wants to gain, about the *pericope adulterae*, the doxology in Romans, the conclusion to Mark, and so on. The description of *Σαυποῦ* 25 (saec. X) leads one to hope that unknown fragments of Irenaeus and Origen (among others) may be recovered from it.

Each volume is furnished with an Index of the MSS, a list of dated MSS, a list of the MSS in chronological order, from which it appears that in neither collection are there any older than the tenth century, and the names of scribes. The expedition and the publication of its results were made possible by American public and private munificence, and the record of the difficulties encountered by the author and his companions makes very interesting reading. It has been impossible in this notice to exhaust the importance of these publications.

A. SOUTER.

University of Aberdeen.

EDWIN MAYSER: *Grammatik der griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit*. Band I. Laut- und Wortlehre. III. Teil: Stammbildung. Zweite umgearbeitete Auflage. Pp. viii+308. Berlin and Leipzig: de Gruyter, 1936. Paper, RM. 40 (bound, 41.50).

THE publication of Mayser's great work was begun (apart from preliminary 'Gymnasialprogramme' in 1898 and 1900) in the year 1906; the last part of Vol. II, reviewed in *C.R.* XLVIII, 242, appeared in 1934. In the interval many Ptolemaic papyri of importance had been added to the available material, and though the foundations were so well laid in Vol. I that no alteration in the main plan of the work was called for, there was much to be done in the way of expanding and supplementing the lists in Vol. I and correcting details. The present volume marks the beginning of this task. In the original edition the subject of stem-formation was treated at the end of the volume, as Section B of the second part. The immense increase in the number of words found in papyri suggested to Mayser the advisability of beginning his new edition with this section, and hence it is issued first, though, to facilitate reference to the first edition and prevent dislocation of the structure of the work, it is numbered II¹, and the subsections bear the same numbers as before. How immensely the material has grown may be estimated from the fact that whereas this section in the 1906 volume occupied but 95 pages it now fills a volume of 308.

The principle of admission is that common types of formation, familiar in all periods of the language, are noticed only if new examples occur in papyri, inscriptions, or ostraca; but types specially characteristic of the *Koine* are as far as possible fully registered. Words occurring in Polybius are marked with an asterisk, words not found in Preisigke's *Wörterbuch* with an obelus. A great improvement on the previous edition is the addition of meanings.

It is unnecessary now to praise Mayser's handling of his subject. This new edition will, like its predecessor, claim a place in all important papyrological libraries.

H. I. BELL.

British Museum.

Études de Papyrologie, Tome III. Pp. 113; 1 plate of facsimiles. Cairo: Imprimerie de l'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale, 1936. Paper, P.T. 38.5.

ANOTHER attractive volume from the Société Royale Égyptienne de Papyrologie. The first of the three items which it offers is 'Early Byzantine Papyri from the Cairo Museum,' by A. E. R. Boak, a continuation of the important series of texts from Karanis begun in Vol. II. Of great value for the new system of tax-assessment introduced by Diocletian are Nos. 8-10 (to which are appended re-editions of the parallel documents, P. Thead. 54 and 55), which are returns of land, and No. 12, which is a personal return.

The other two articles are by another American scholar, N. Lewis, the first, in English, a publication of some Greek literary papyri in the Strasbourg collection, the second, in French, an edition of twenty-six Greek ostraca in the Cairo Museum, with indices. None of these latter is in itself of special importance, but they form a useful addition to the list of published ostraca. Much more worthy of note are the literary papyri. The first is a curious Homeric exercise, consisting apparently of a prose synopsis of *Iliad* VI with a quotation of ll. 448-455. It is remarkable for its early date, about the middle of the third century B.C.; the quotation, though it offers three new readings, contains no 'eccentric' lines. Three Homeric fragments follow. The fifth text is by far the most important of the collection: it is the papyrus, partially published by Crönert in 1922, which contains a collection of lyrics from the plays of Euripides. The considerable fragments are here published in full and are of great interest. It is, to begin with, a noteworthy contribution to the history of the anthology habit to find such a collection at so early a date; for Mr. Lewis, differing from Crönert, who dated them in the later Ptolemaic period, would place them about the middle of the third century B.C. It is a pity he was not able to add a facsimile. Textually they are of considerable value. The plays which occur are the *Phoenissae*, the *Medea*, and an unknown play which Lewis doubtfully and on somewhat slender evidence would identify with the *Melanippe Desmotis*. Of some interest too is No. 6, a rhetorical exercise consisting of a declamation against Alcibiades. A treatise on heroes of mythology and a medical fragment complete the publication.

H. I. BELL.
British Museum.

CLARA M. SMERTENKO AND GEORGE N. BELKNAP: *Studies in Greek Religion*. Pp. 61. (University of Oregon Publication, Vol. V, No. 1.) Eugene: University of Oregon, 1935. Paper, 50 cents.

IN his short preface Mr. Belknap tells us of the late Mrs. Smertenko's unfinished plan to write a book 'which should be an interpretation of the meaning and value of the Greek religion to the Greek peoples in historic times,' a plan born of an aversion from the concentration of scholars on 'origins and minute studies to

increase our poor supply of facts.' The three essays here published were material for this work. They are on *The Political Relations of the Delphic Oracle*, *Greek Drama as Religious Ritual*, and *The Political Sympathies of Aeschylus* (the last reprinted from *J.H.S.*, 1932). Mrs. Smertenko's aim is commendable, but it must be confessed that fuller documentation and fewer unsubstantiated generalizations would have been welcome. The papers must be regarded as readable essays rather than serious studies, although, so regarded, their idiom (e.g. the verbs 'function' and 'envision' and the statement that 'sacred history was revamped') will not suit every taste.

There follow two papers by Mr. Belknap on *Religion in Plato's States* and *The Social Value of Dionysiac Ritual*, which are more fully supported by evidence and more provocative of thought.

W. K. C. GUTHRIE.

Peterhouse, Cambridge.

L. LAURAND: *Études sur le style des discours de Cicéron*: 4^e ed. Tome I. Pp. iv+116+6. Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres', 1936. Paper.

THE first edition of these *Études* appeared twenty-nine years ago: this is now the fourth, for M. Laurand, ever a benefactor of humane studies, does not, like some others, allow the demand for his great work merely to raise the price of second-hand copies to ransom figures. In this first volume there are no great amplifications, and the changes, if it is compared with the edition of 1907, are not very numerous: the 29-page bibliography which appeared at the beginning of the work is now, since the second edition, part of Vol. II; since that edition also, the chapter on *Discours prononcés et discours publiés* takes account of the views of Opperskalski, Draheim, and E. G. Hardy. The main part of this volume deals, as earlier readers will recollect, with *Tulliana puritas*, *Pureté de la langue*: overshadowed though it was by the importance of Book II *Le nombre oratoire* (which has still to come in its revised form), Laurand's comparison of Cicero's oratorical vocabulary with the vocabulary of his quotations and with that also of his treatises can never be negligible; and its sound scholarship, accurate knowledge of the literature, and perennial freshness of outlook render it a model for all such inquiries. A work so unwithered by age needs no further commendation.

R. G. NISBET.

University of Glasgow.

WOLFGANG ALV: *Livius und Ennius. Von römischer Art*. Pp. 52. (Neue Wege zur Antike, II. Reihe: Interpretationen. Heft 5.) Leipzig and Berlin: Teubner, 1936. Stiff paper, export price RM. 2.10.

IN the course of this short study the author argues that scholars have not only underestimated the extent to which Livy went beyond his annalistic sources and shaped his material into an artistic form, but have also failed to do justice to the fact that the historian in doing so

must have been considerably influenced by the Epic of Ennius (and also to some extent by his Tragedies). On such a theme definite statements are, of course, impossible. Dr Aly no doubt, if he had wished, could have added to the list of possible *disiecti membra poetae* to be found in Livy's work; but he has based his case not on verbal points, but rather on the structure of incidents, the arrangement of material, and the general spirit of the treatment to be found in Livy's early books. No very conclusive argument emerges, and in dealing with Ennius the author avoids discussing the more controversial questions concerning the arrangement of material in the *Annales*. Yet the subject is tactfully handled, and the study is certainly not dull. Remarks intended to help a modern reader to appreciate the quality of Roman patriotism are included. Unfortunately one reader at least finds that his own admiration for the Roman spirit is diminished rather than increased by the author's excessive enthusiasm. It would be unfair, however, to attribute the blame for this entirely to Dr Aly.

S. K. JOHNSON.

Armstrong College, Newcastle-upon-Tyne.

WILLY THEILER: *Das Musengedicht des Horaz*. Pp. 30. (Schriften der Königsberger Gelehrten Gesellschaft, IV, 1935.) Halle: Niemeyer, 1936. Paper, 3s. 6d.

IN this learned commentary on Horace's Ode III, 4 the author considers it point by point and adduces a large number of passages, some of them illuminating, from Greek literature; in particular he shows its debt to Pindar and Greek choral lyric, not only in details but also in general 'economy.' To this extent his work is a valuable amplification of the notes in Kiessling-Heinze: the understanding of Horace's Odes has been seriously prejudiced in the past by neglect of the traditional element.

But what of the meaning of the poem as a whole? Theiler maintains, perhaps rightly, that it is disjointed because it represents the Roman idea of a Pindaric ode (cf. IV, 4). But it is natural to seek some underlying and unifying thought, and this he finds in what he calls the 'Theory of the *lógos*', i.e. the *lene consilium*, the civilizing influence connected with the Muses. So far, so good. But had Horace no further purpose? Theiler equates the *lógos* to *φρόνησις*, and tries to show that Odes III, 1-4 form a series designed to celebrate the four cardinal virtues. The attempt is strained and unconvincing, and there is really no evidence for dating the poem 27 B.C. either; Heinze is probably right in supposing 1-6 to have been written separately and only collected later. A more plausible explanation of the meaning is that given by L. A. Mackay in *C.R.* XLVI (1932), pp. 243 ff.; following Orelli, he suggests that this ode is oracular and obscure in train of thought for a particular reason: that under cover of celebrating the victory of the earthly Jove over the latter-day Titans the poet is hinting to the joint-author of the proscriptions of 43 that he would be well advised to bury the hatchet, and not institute another 'clean-up' in 29. The previous ode is equally oracular,

and it contains an undoubted hint in the mouth of Juno. Once this idea is accepted, the diplomatic coherence of the fourth ode becomes clear and the last stanzas are perceived to be full of relevant undertones. It is a far more important document for the relationship between Augustus and the poets than Theiler's commentary would suggest.

L. P. WILKINSON.

King's College, Cambridge.

HOWARD ROLLIN PATCH: *The Tradition of Boethius*. A Study of His Importance in Medieval Culture. Pp. viii + 200; 7 photographs. New York: Oxford University Press (London: Milford), 1935. Cloth, \$2.75 or 10s. 6d.

DR. PATCH has written in this small volume a very interesting and competent introduction to the study of Boethius's influence upon medieval culture. Modestly disclaiming the intention to do more than marshal generally accepted facts, he has carried out his purpose with considerable skill. He has chapters on the tradition and legend of Boethius, on medieval thought, on translations of the *Consolatio*, and on imitations and influence. Of these, that on medieval thought is the least satisfactory. The philosophical and scientific treatises of Boethius were, as the author admits, of the highest importance in shaping medieval thought; but the amount of space given to the consideration of this influence is inadequate, though in the very full notes the reader is furnished with a guide to the work that has already been done in elucidating their importance. The main interest of the book centres in the *Consolatio*; and Dr. Patch writes excellently about the many translations of the famous work, about the imitations of it and its literary influence. Here and there he seems to go a little too far, especially with writers of the 16th and 17th centuries, in seeing the direct influence of Boethius in what is no more than the general influence of a revived classical tradition. The translations from Latin are sometimes a little loose: thus on p. 3 the phrase 'without the prejudice of age' is not the meaning of Ennodius's *sine aetatis praeiudicio*; and the author does himself less than justice in allowing us to assume on p. 16 that in his opinion Miss Waddell's verses can seriously be regarded as conveying the meaning of Gerbert's verses. The very full notes and bibliography are a valuable supplement to the text. I would add to complete the bibliography on p. 175 that the missing word on the title page of the Harvard copy of Cardan's *de Consolatione* is Aureliopolis.

R. M. HENRY.

Queen's University, Belfast.

A. E. GORDON: *Epigraphica, I*. On the first appearance of the cognomen in Latin inscriptions of freedmen. Pp. 8. Berkeley, California: University of California Press (Cambridge: University Press), 1935. Paper, 25 cents.

PROFESSOR GORDON re-examines Mommsen's thesis that the cognomina of freedmen began to

appear in writing c. 100 B.C. and concludes that he was right. 106 to 92 B.C. is a transition period before which freedmen lack cognomina and after which they have them. To Mommsen's five inscriptions he adds one dated inscription for his transition period, six others dated between 84 and 44 B.C. and twelve from Delos. Of the last, however, only two can legitimately be used, one because it has a consular date (113 B.C.), the other because it cannot be later than c. 112/1 because of the archonship of a Dionysius. It is probably from c. 141/0 (Dinsmoor, *Archons of Athens*, pp. 269 and 540). Furthermore Mommsen's *CIL* I² 663 (130 or 92 B.C.) would annihilate the whole thesis if the earlier date proved correct. Lommatsch (ed. I²) preferred the later date on account of the cognomina. While, therefore, Professor Gordon and Mommsen are perhaps right as far as the facts go, these are so few (six inscriptions down to 94 B.C., seven after 84) that the former's criticism of Cagnat, Egbert, Sandys-Campbell, etc. for failing to mention Mommsen's finding as an aid to dating seems both unnecessarily severe and diffuse.

LESLIE F. SMITH.

Columbia University.

ARTHUR E. R. BOAK: *Soknopaiou Nesos*: The University of Michigan Excavations at Dimé in 1931-32. Pp. xii+47; 13 plates, 16 plans. (University of Michigan Studies, Humanistic Series, Vol. XXXIX.) Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1935. Cloth, \$2.50.

IT is regrettable that difficulties of transport and water-supply compelled the suspension of the Michigan excavations at Dimé after a single season's work, for this lonely site has a real fascination and some importance for the question of the lake and cultivation levels in the Fayûm. The finds were not remarkable but added useful data to what was known concerning the economic and cultural history of the province. They included a small group of customs-receipts, here published, some of them having seals with readable legends, two fragmentary inscriptions on stone, and a few coins, not very exciting but useful for dating purposes. The evidence is here well set out with good photographs and plans. On p. 26, l. 6 of papyrus 1, εθ' is a misprint for εφ'; and there seems some inconsistency as to the economic condition of the village in the first half of the first century B.C. between Mr. Peterson on p. 20 and Mr. Haatvedt on p. 38. H. I. BELL.

British Museum.

Map of Gaul to Illustrate Caesar's Campaigns. London and Edinburgh: W. and A. K. Johnston. 14s. [For details see *C.R.* XLIX. 212.]

THIS wall-map should prove useful for the teaching of Caesar in schools. The names of the chief tribes and towns stand out clearly, and the general routes followed by the Roman armies in the chief operations are indicated by red lines numbered according to the book of the *Bellum Gallicum* concerned. A map of this

nature should not be bespattered with question marks, and, as is right, the many doubtful points are not allowed to harass the beginner, while the modern names of well-known sites are given as well as the Latin names. The printer has been allowed to place the name Aedui too far south—it would look better written boldly across the centre of their territory. Some of the tribes shown as occupying southern Britain are not mentioned by Caesar at all; recent research has established the fact that the Atrebates did not arrive in the island until after his invasion, and the other Belgae are shown too far to the west. In Gaul, Aquae Sextiae is placed too far east; the river Dore is wrongly marked as the upper course of the Elaver, which is thus made to flow near Thiers instead of within sight of Gergovia; similarly the 'Fl.' of 'Sequana Fl.' turns the Aube into the upper Seine. It may, however, be a mere matter of taste to prefer Cabillonum to Cavillonum, Santones to Santoni, and Gallia Citerior (or the familiar Gallia Cisalpina) to Provincia Citerior. O. P. F. BROGAN.

Oxford.

Illustrated Regional Guides to Ancient Monuments under the ownership or guardianship of H.M. Office of Works. Vol. II: Southern England, by W. ORMSBY GORE. Pp. 88; 21 plates, 1 map. London: H.M. Stationery Office, 1936. Cloth, 1s. (post free, 1s. 1d.).

THE first volume of this series quickly and deservedly proved itself in demand, and it is sufficient to say that the second volume, rather larger and covering monuments under the Office's care in counties south of the Thames, maintains the same high standard of accuracy and production. The excellent concise account of the Iron Age and Roman Period (pp. 17 ff.) is typical of the material provided, and experts as well as younger students and amateurs will welcome these guides as sound introductory surveys of the archaeology and architecture of important historical remains within their areas, in addition to their practical utility for those who wish to visit the monuments themselves.

G. CLEMENT WHITTICK.

Armstrong College,
Newcastle-upon-Tyne.

Milton's Lament for Damon and his other Latin Poems. Rendered into English by WALTER SKEAT. With preface and introductions by E. H. VISIACK. Pp. vii+109. London: Oxford University Press, 1935. Cloth, 5s.

A SATISFACTORY rendering of poetry must (1) preserve the poetic quality, and (2) be reasonably faithful to the sense, of the original. Upon the translator of Milton's Latin poems a further demand has to be made: that his diction and general tone be Miltonic. Mr. Skeat satisfies all three requirements in remarkable measure. Drawing on what must be a very exceptional knowledge of his author, he pre-

serves with scrupulous care the atmosphere of Milton's work, constantly employing words and turns of phrase and often, too, spellings which Milton himself affected; yet his version does not read at all like a Miltonic cento. It has, on the contrary, substantial merit as poetry; indeed it is no exaggeration to say that many passages convey the impression that had Milton written them in English rather than in Latin he might have produced something closely similar to Mr. Skeat's translation. Mr. Skeat is not always equally successful (indeed the original poems vary in merit), but rarely does he fall below a high level, and many lines are as poetically fine as they are faithful to Milton's spirit. Mr. Visiak's notes and introductions add to the value of a volume which confers a real boon on lovers of Milton, since these poems, rich as some of them are in biographical interest (for, writing in a dead language, the poet felt himself freer to reveal his inmost feelings and aspirations than in his English poems) as well as in poetic merit, deserve to be known by readers to whom the Latin is an obstacle; and Cowper's translations, excellent in their way, are too

much in the eighteenth-century manner to render the true Miltonic tone.

British Museum.

H. I. BELL.

L. F. SMITH, J. H. MCLEAN, C. W. KEYES: *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae Epigraphicae*, The Olcott Dictionary of Latin Inscriptions. Vol. II, fasc. 2: audio—augur. Pp. 24. New York: Columbia University Press (London: Milford), 1935. Paper, \$0.75 or 3s. 6d.

PERHAPS the most interesting articles in this portion, which maintains the character of its predecessors, are 'ave' and 'augur.' The fact that the spelling *have* predominates in inscriptions is supported by the evidence of the best MSS. When the article *augur* is completed, we shall have a full record of the widespread occurrence of this title in inscriptions. The rarity of such words as *aucho*, *auello*, *auena*, *augesco*, *augmen*, *augmento* is interesting and significant. Nor must the importance of the proper names within this section be overlooked. The book will be immensely useful.

University of Aberdeen.

A. SOUTER.

SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS

(A reference to *C.R.* denotes a notice already published in the *Classical Review*.)

GNOMON.

XII. 7. JULY, 1936.

Proclus, *The Elements of Theology* ed. E. R. Dodds [*C.R.* XLVIII. 140] (Theiler). Very highly praised. *Commentaires de Pappus et de Théon d'Alexandrie sur l'Almageste*. Texte établi et annoté par A. Rome. Tome 1: *Pappus d'Alexandrie. Commentaire sur les livres 5 et 6 de l'Almageste* [*C.R.* XLVI. 185] (v. Fritz). The beginning of a very important work concerned with the theory of astronomy which held the field until Copernicus. *Scholium in Apollonium Rhodium vetera* rec. C. Wendel [Berlin: Weidmann, 1935. Pp. xxviii+402] (Adler). A useful piece of work well executed. *St. Basile, Aux jeunes gens* . . . ed. F. Boulenger [*C.R.* L. 37] (Witkowski). The edition marks a great step forward and the introduction and notes further our knowledge. A. Vogt: *Constantin VII Porphyrogénète, Le Livre des Cérémonies*. Tome 1: *Livre 1 Chapitres 1-46* (37), 2 vols. [Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1935. Pp. xi+179 double+180-183, and xxxiii+194, 2 maps] (Baynes). While recognizing the importance of V.'s work, B. thinks that the commentary in subsequent volumes might be improved by being less circumscribed. *Pindari carmina cum fragmentis* ed. C. M. Bowra [*C.R.* L. 14] (Turyn). The text, founded on Mommsen's apparatus and Schroeder's edition, is useful; the critical notes are carelessly copied from others, unscientifically presented, and

absolutely worthless. *Hippokrates, Ueber Entstehung und Aufbau des menschlichen Körpers* edited under the direction of K. Deichgräber [*C.R.* L. 62] (Diller). Schwyzler's discussion of the language is good. With the text (Schubring and Jacob) and the commentary (Deichgräber) D. has much fault to find, though an advance on Littré is admitted. 1. *Xenophontis commentarii* rec. C. Hude [*C.R.* XLIX. 90]; 2. L. Castiglioni: *Studi intorno alla storia del testo dell'Anabasi di Senofonte* [Milan: Hoepli, 1932. Pp. 46]; 3. E. Ekman: *Zu Xenophons Hipparchikos* [Diss. Uppsala: Almqvist and Wiksell, 1933. Pp. 97] (Wifstrand). 1. Differs little from Marchant's edition except that the apparatus is fuller and clearer. 2. C. examines four MSS. which do something to clarify the history of previously used MSS. 3. Good work, especially on the text, though not all the judgments are sound. 1. A. Hörnschemeyer: *Die Pferdezucht im klassischen Altertum*; 2. F. Vincke: *Die Rindersucht im alten Italien*; 3. K. Winkelstern: *Die Schweinezucht im klassischen Altertum*; 4. K. Zeissig: *Die Rindersucht im alten Griechenland*; 5. O. Brendel: *Die Schafzucht im alten Griechenland* [Dissertation, Giessen 1929-1934] (Marg). The books are useful as far as they go, but much is left unsaid. H. H. Scullard: *A History of the Roman World from 753 to 146 B.C.* [*C.R.* L. 78] (Passerini). Not well balanced and open to numerous objections. G. Niccolini: *I Fasti dei Tribuni della Plebe* [*C.R.* XLIX. 145] (Münzer). A much enlarged but in essence not much altered edition of a book published in

1898. Good in parts. X. F. M. G. Wolters: *Notes on Antique Folklore*. . . [C.R. L. 42] (Rose). R. expands the notice which he contributed to C.R. R. von Uslar, K. Bettermann und H. Ricken: *Römisch-germanische Keramik im Saalburg-Museum*, 1934 (Woelcke). Three unconnected papers. Those by von U. and R. are of general importance, but B. adds nothing to our knowledge. 1. *Tertulliani Ad nationes libri duo* ed. J. G. Ph. Borleffs [C.R. XLIII. 243]; 2. *Tertulliani De baptismo* ed. Borleffs [C.R. XLVI. 91] (Zellinger). B. has brought modern methods and great prudence to the help of two very difficult tracts. Q. S. *Florentis Tertulliani libellum De testimonio animae* ed. W. A. J. C. Scholte [C.R. XLIX. 41] (Hoppe). Follows the 'best' MS. too closely, but the commentary, despite doubtful Latin, is intelligent and intelligible. *The Scriptores Historiae Augustae* (Magie) vol. 3 [C.R. XLVIII. 41] (Hohl). H. congratulates himself that the use of his own edition has improved M.'s final volume. J. Hutton: *The Greek Anthology in Italy to the year 1800* [C.R. XLIX. 152] (Schalk). This systematic history of the epigram is very welcome. J. Psichari: *Quelques travaux de linguistique, de philologie et de littérature hellénique 1884-1928*. Tome I [Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1930. Pp. 1337]; 2. G. Rouillard: *Notice Biographique et Bibliographie de Jean Psichari* [Melun: Imprimerie Administrative, 1930. Pp. 12] (Schwyzer). 1. Much of importance for specialists and something for a wider circle. 2. Useful and interesting.

XII. 8. AUGUST, 1936.

F. Messerschmidt: *Bronzezeit und frühe Eisenzzeit in Italien* [Berlin: de Gruyter, 1935. Pp. 77, 16 plates, 4"] (Matz). The book does not satisfactorily represent modern research. 1. F. Altheim: *Terra Mater* [C.R. XLV. 74]; 2. E. Tabelaing: *Mater Larum* [Frankfurt a. M.: Klostermann, 1932. Pp. 104] (Linkomies). 1. Necessary pioneer work, but A.'s results require close investigation. 2. T. tackles difficult problems. His book is suggestive, but should be used with care. C. Bosch: *Die kleinasiatischen Münzen der römischen Kaiserzeit*. Part 2: *Einzeluntersuchungen*. Vol. 1: *Bithynien*, Part 1 [Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1935. Pp. 298] (Strack). To judge from a small part of the whole work, the comprehensive collection of material is admirable; but the new results are not always acceptable. *Papyri Varsovienses* ed. G. Manteuffel [C.R. XLIX. 241] (Schubart). A good edition of literary and non-literary papyri of unequal importance. Sch. discusses in detail two of the more interesting documents. *Novum Testamentum graece et latine apparatu critico instructum* ed. P. A. Merk [Rome: Pont. Inst. Biblici, 1933. Pp. 35+854 double pages] (Opitz). Endless labour has gone to this edition, in which, however, O. finds many errors. He suggests different plans for future editions of the New Testament. Sir R. W. Livingstone: *Greek Ideals and Modern Life* [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1935. Pp. x+175] (Lesky). Freshly written. Most interesting is the survey of the influence of Greek

humanism on English thought. W. Kröhlting: *Die Priamel (Beispielreihe) als Stilmittel in der griechisch-römischen Dichtung* [Greifswald: Dallmeyer, 1935. Pp. 94] (Römisches). There are some omissions, but the book will be permanently useful. I. Sellschopp: *Stilistische Untersuchungen zu Hesiod* [C.R. XLIX. 60] (Schwenn). Though sometimes too subjective S.'s book makes an important contribution to a new and deeper picture of Hesiod. M. K. Flickinger: *The 'Apapria of Sophokles' Antigone* [C.R. XLIX. 95] (Camerer). Not convincing; important books are ignored. F. Solmsen: *Antiphonstudien* [Berlin: Weidmann, 1931. Pp. vi+78] (Zucker). Improves the text and interpretation of several difficult passages. H. Widmann: *Beiträge zur Syntax Epikurs* [Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1935. Pp. xv+266] (Schmid). Sets our knowledge of Epicurus on a surer basis. Plutarch: *Griechische Heldenleben* [pp. viii+281], *Römische Heldenleben* [pp. 398], *Helden und Schicksale* [pp. 436] translated and explained by W. Ax [three vols. Leipzig: Kröner, 1935] (Sieveking). Welcome translations with useful notes not burdened with detail of secondary importance.—Bibliographical Supplement 1936 Nr. 4 (down to July 31).

PHILOLOGISCHE WOCHENSCHRIFT.

(APRIL-JUNE, 1936.)

GREEK LITERATURE.—A. Höfler, *Der Sapphishymnus des Ailios Aristides* [Stuttgart-Berlin, 1935. Pp. 119] (J. Mesk). The main feature of this valuable work is the excellent commentary, which throws light on each sentence from every point of view and fights shy of no difficulty.—W. Nachstätt, W. Sieveking, J. B. Titchener, *Plutarchi Moralia, Vol. II* [C.R. L. 127] (J. Schönemann). Reviewer praises conscientious thoroughness of this edition, but mentions some points of disagreement or doubt.

LATIN LITERATURE.—Schanz-Hosius, *Geschichte der römischen Literatur, 2. Teil: Die römische Literatur in der Zeit der Monarchie bis auf Hadrian*, 4th edition [Munich, 1935. Beck. Pp. xvii+886] (R. Helm). Revision of Schanz could not have been entrusted to better hands. The good is kept and augmented, the faulty corrected.—H. Lindgren, *Studia Curtiana* [C.R. XLIX. 243] (A. Kraemer). Most industrious and thorough work on the text of Curtius. Deserves praise, even if there is sometimes room for disagreement.—M. Schäfer, *Ein frühmittelstoisches System der Ethik bei Cicero* [C.R. XLIX. 29] (R. Philippson). S.'s main object is to show that De Finibus III is solely modelled on a work probably by Antipater. Reviewer considers the attempt a failure in general, but it contains many observations worthy of notice.—A. Kappelmacher, *Die Literatur der Römer bis zur Karolingerzeit* [C.R. L. 69] (A. Klotz). Contains stimulating thoughts and fine passages, but is much distorted by carelessness and inaccuracy.—N. Vianello, *D. Junii Iuvenalis satirae* [C.R. L. 26] (R. Helm). Recension of text, which is

discussed in a long introduction in fluent Latin, shows sound judgment. Reviewer examines and criticizes the readings in some detail.

HISTORY.—G. Tzenoff, *Geschichte der Bulgaren und der anderen Südslaven von der römischen Eroberung der Balkanhalbinsel an bis zum Ende des neunten Jahrhunderts* [Berlin, 1935, de Gruyter. Pp. xv+272] (W. Enslein). Claims to re-write a large chapter of history. Totally inadequate. Unusually long review.—Barbara Försch, *Die politische Rolle der Frau in der römischen Republik* [Stuttgart, 1935, Kohlhammer. Pp. 126] (E. Hohl). Careful collection of material is undoubtedly useful. But has not entirely escaped the danger of distortion by focussing too powerful a light on inadequate subject-matter.

PHILOSOPHY.—M. Wundt, *Platons Parmenides* [Stuttgart, 1935, Kohlhammer. Pp. 81] (J. Pavlu). Exemplary investigation; deserves careful study.—H. Willms, *Εἰκὼν* [C.R. XLIX, 179] (H. Leisegang). Collects the numerous meanings and uses of εἰκὼν from the whole of Greek and Latin literature. Detailed interpretation of relevant passages in Philo quite correct, but fails to recognize the wider setting in which Philo moves.—G. R. Morrow, *Studies in the Platonic Epistles with a translation and notes*. [C.R. L, 22] (J. Pavlu). Examines the philosophical and more especially the political contents of the letters. Careful work. Will be studied by all who desire more light on the subject.

EPIGRAPHY.—*Inscriptiones Graecae. Vol. II et III editio minor III, i: Inscriptiones Atticae Euclidis anno posteriores. Fasc. I: Dedications, tituli honorarii, tituli sacri*. Ed. J. Kirchner [Berlin, 1935, de Gruyter. Pp. vi+362] (E. Ziebarth). Very varied contents, which reviewer rapidly summarizes. Experts will admire and rejoice in what has been accomplished.

LAW.—J. Lengle, *Römisches Strafrecht bei Cicero und den Historikern* [C.R. XLIX, 157] (B. Kübler). Wealth of historical material and clear description constitute the chief merit

of this stimulating book.—H. Volkmann, *Zur Rechtsprechung im Principat des Augustus. Historische Beiträge* [Munich, 1935, Beck. Pp. xiii+227] (E. Hohl). This attractive and useful book will be gratefully welcomed by historians.

ARCHAEOLOGY.—M. Schede, *Die Ruinen von Priene* [Berlin, 1934, de Gruyter. Pp. 115, with 127 illustrations and one plan] (H. Lamer). Excellent guide, to the point, brief but always clear, and well illustrated.—G. Elderkin, *Antioch on the Orontes. The Excavations of 1932* [1934. Pp. 156, and 17 plates] (W. Müller). The comprehensive collection and conscientious description of the finds in this joint American and French excavation as well as the production of this volume fulfil all expectations.—P. de la Coste-Messelière, *Fouilles de Delphes. Tome IV (3) Monuments figurés. Sculpture. Art archaïque. Sculptures des temples* [Paris, 1931, de Boccard. Pp. 85, with 25 figures and 12 photographic plates] (G. Lippold). Careful descriptions and sound judgment in discussing the problems.—J. Audiat, *Fouilles de Delphes. Tome II. Topographie et architecture. Le Trésor des Athéniens* [Paris, 1933, de Boccard. Pp. ii+109, with 79 figures, 23 plates from drawings, and 17 photographic plates] (G. Lippold). Denotes a great advance for the history of Greek architecture.

COMMUNICATIONS.—4 Apr., H. Lamer, *Nachkommen des Dichters Horaz* ($\frac{3}{4}$ col.). 18 Apr., G. Weicker, *Das Ende der kretischen Seemacht* (1 $\frac{1}{2}$ cols.). 25 Apr., P. E. Sonnenburg, *De Lucr. I 50* (15 lines); I. Hopfner, *nemorensis?* (1 col.). 2 May, A. Kurfess, *Horatiana* (2 cols.). 16 May, F. Walter, *Zu den Scriptoribus Historiae Augustae* (2 $\frac{1}{2}$ cols.). 23 May, W. Voigt, *September-December* (2 cols.). 30 May, A. Kraemer, *De Sallusti bell. Jug. I, 4* ($\frac{1}{2}$ col.); F. Mertens, *Hispania baskischen Ursprungs* ($\frac{1}{2}$ col.). 13 June, J. Pavlu, *Zur pseudoplatonischen Epinomis* (4 cols.); J. F. K. Dirichs, *Wider E. Goldmann's Rezension meines Duenos-Inscript-Buches* (1 col.).

BOOKS RECEIVED

All publications which have a bearing on classical studies will be entered in this list if they are sent for review. The price should in all cases be stated.

. Excerpts or extracts from periodicals and collections will not be included unless they are also published separately.

Agrell (S.) *Die pergamenische Zauberscheibe und das Tarockspiel*. Pp. 130; 68 figures. (Bulletin de la Société Royale des Lettres de Lund 1935-6, IV.) Lund: Gleerup (London: Milford), 1936. Paper, 3s.

Baggally (J. W.) *The Klephtic Ballads in Relation to Greek History (1715-1821)*. Pp. xiv+109. Oxford: Blackwell, 1936. Cloth, 7s. 6d.

Bibliotheca Philologica Classica. Band 61 (1934). Bearbeitet von W. Rehnitz. Pp. vi+263. Leipzig: Reisland, 1936. Paper.

Bonaszti (G.) *Catulli Carmina*. Poesie di Gaio Valerio Catullo. Testo e versione metrica. In appendice: Esame dei passi

controversi. Pp. xx+275. Rome: Signorelli, 1936. Paper, L. 15.

Buchmann (K.) *Die Stellung des Menon in der Platonischen Philosophie*. Pp. viii+102. (Philologus, Supplementband XXIX, Heft 3.) Leipzig: Dieterich, 1936. Paper, M. 6 (bound, 7.50).

Carrington (R. C.) *Pompeii*. Pp. xii+197; 21 figures, 24 plates. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1936. Cloth, 10s. 6d.

Chodaczek (A.) *De Prisciani Lydi Solutionum capite VI*. Pp. 42. Lwów: Gubrynowicz, 1936. Paper.

Commentationes Vindobonenses. I. Jahrgang.

- Pp. 128. Vienna University (Fachschaft der Altphilologen), 1935. Paper, RM. 4.
- Corinth*. Vol. III, Part II. The Defenses of Acrocorinth and the Lower Town. By Rhys Carpenter and Antoine Bon, with contributions by A. W. Parsons. Pp. xvi+315; 10 plates, 241 figures, plan (in pocket). Cambridge, U.S.A.: Harvard University Press, 1936. Cloth.
- Corpus Vasorum Antiquorum*. United States of America. University of California. Fascicule 1. By H. R. W. Smith. Pp. 60; 62 plates. Cambridge, U.S.A.: Harvard University Press (London: Milford). Cloth and boards, 22s. 6d.
- Evelyn* (F. A.) The Bacchae of Euripides translated. Pp. 60. London: Heath Cranton, 1936. Paper, 1s. 6d.
- Fiddian* (C. M.) A First Latin Course. Pp. xii+180. London: Martin Hopkinson, 1936. Cloth, 3s.
- Foerster* (O.) Handschriftliche Untersuchungen zu Senekas Epistulae Morales und Naturales Quaestiones. Pp. 56; 2 plates. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1936. Paper, RM. 3.60.
- Hanell* (K.) Zur Diskussion über die Ara Pacis. Pp. 12; 2 plates. (Bulletin de la Société Royale des Lettres de Lund 1935-6, V.) Lund: Gleerup (London: Milford), 1936. Paper, 1s.
- Harder* (R.) Plotins Schriften übersetzt. Band III. Die Schriften 30-38 der chronologischen Reihenfolge. Pp. 197. Leipzig: Meiner, 1936. Paper, RM. 8 (bound, 9.50).
- Hugill* (W. M.) Panhellenism in Aristophanes. Pp. viii+106. Chicago: University of Chicago Press (Cambridge: University Press), 1936. Cloth, 7s.
- Hyle*. *Mors laniata. Ferae montanae*. Pp. 19+11+11. Amsterdam: Academia Regia Discipularum Nederlandica, 1936. Paper.
- Klaus* (K.) Die Adjektiva bei Menander. Pp. xvi+160. (Klassisch-Philologische Studien, Heft 8.) Leipzig: Harrassowitz, 1936. Paper, M. 8.
- Koster* (W. J. W.) Traité de Métrique Grecque. Suivi d'un Précis de Métrique Latine. Pp. ii+328. Leyden: Sijthoff, 1936. Paper, fl. 8 (cloth, 9).
- Kuiper* (W. E. J.) Grieksche Origineelen en Latijnische Navolgingen. Zes Komédies van Menander bij Terentius en Plautus. Pp. 294. (Verhandelingen der Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen te Amsterdam, Afd. Letterkunde, Nieuwe Reeks, Deel XXXVIII, No. 2.) Amsterdam: Noord-Hollandsche Uitgevers-Maatschappij, 1936. Paper, f. 8.
- Liddell and Scott*. A Greek-English Lexicon. A new edition. Part 9. σισυλλος-τραγῶδ. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1936. Paper, 10s. 6d.
- Lindsay* (J.) Marc Antony. His World and his Contemporaries. Pp. xii+330; illustrations. London: Routledge, 1936. Cloth, 15s.
- Marsh* (F. B.) and *Leon* (H. J.) Tacitus. Selections from His Works. Edited with Introduction and Notes. Pp. xi+546; illustrations. New York: Prentice-Hall, 1936. Cloth, \$2.25.
- Monumenta Palaeographica Vetera*. First Series. Dated Greek Minuscule Manuscripts to the Year 1200. Edited by K. and S. Lake. V. Manuscripts in Paris, Part II, Oxford, Berlin, Vienna and Jerusalem. Pp. 20; plates 301-373. Boston, U.S.A.: American Academy of Arts and Sciences (London: Christophers), 1936. Portfolio.
- Northumberland and Durham Classical Association*. A Third Record (1929-36) of the Proceedings. By B. Anderton. Pp. 43. Newcastle: Northumberland Press, 1936. Paper.
- Pickard-Cambridge* (A. W.) Balliol and Edinburgh Compositions. Translations into Greek and Latin Prose. Pp. iv+135. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1936. Cloth, 7s. 6d.
- Poynton* (J. B.) Versions. Pp. 195. Oxford: Blackwell, 1936. Cloth, 10s. 6d.
- Raglan* (Lord) The Hero. A Study in Tradition, Myth and Drama. Pp. xi+311. London: Methuen, 1936. Cloth, 10s. 6d.
- Rand* (E. K.) Les esprits souverains dans la littérature romaine. Pp. 79. (Extrait de la Revue des Cours et Conférences.) Paris: Boivin, 1936. Paper.
- Reitsenstein* (E.) Wirklichkeitsbild und Gefühlsentwicklung bei Properz. Pp. 110. (Philologus, Supplementband XXIX, Heft 2.) Leipzig: Dieterich, 1936. Paper, RM. 6 (bound, 7.50).
- Schmid* (W.) Epikurs Kritik der platonischen Elementenlehre. Pp. 64. Leipzig: Harrassowitz, 1936. Paper, RM. 4.
- Scott* (K.) The Imperial Cult under the Flavians. Pp. 204. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1936. Paper, RM. 9.
- Seiler* (H. G.) Die Masse bei Tacitus. Pp. 94. Erlangen: Palm und Enke, 1936. Paper, M. 3.
- Stanley* (C.) Roots of the Tree. Pp. 107. London: Milford, 1936. Cloth, 5s.
- Svennung* (J.) Untersuchungen zu Palladius und zur lateinischen Fach- und Volkssprache. Pp. xxxv+698. Uppsala: Almqvist och Wiksell, 1935. Paper, Kr. 25.
- Tanzer* (H. H.) The Letters of Pliny the Younger. Selected and Edited together with a Companion to Pliny's Letters. Pp. xxiv+292; 45 illustrations. New York, London etc.: Stechert, 1936. Cloth.
- Teske* (A.) Die Homer=Mimesis in den homerischen Hymnen. Pp. 73. (Greifswalder Beiträge zur Literatur- und Stilforschung, Heft 15.) Greifswald: Dallmeyer, 1936. Paper, RM. 2.
- Vickery* (K. F.) Food in Early Greece. Pp. 97. (Illinois Studies in the Social Sciences, Vol. XX, No. 3.) Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois, 1936. Paper, \$1.
- Walde* (A.) Lateinisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch. Dritte neu bearbeitete Auflage von J. B. Hofmann. Lieferung 9. Pp. 641-720. Heidelberg: Winter, 1936. Paper, M. 1.15.
- Weber* (W.) Princeps. Studien zur Geschichte des Augustus. Band I. Pp. ix+240+266. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1936. Paper RM. 42.

rst
pts
ke.
rd,
o;
ran
on :

ria-
ro-
ew-
per.
lin-
eek
rd :

rd :

adi-
on-

s la
e la
ris :

hls-
iilo-
2.)
l. 6

hen
ras-

the
mer,

. 94-
per,

107.

dius
iche.
och

the
with
xxiv
ndon

den
reifs-
Stil-
eyer,

Pp.
nces,
iver-

ches
flage
641-
aper,

ichte
- 266.
aper